NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME V.---NO. 21. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 229.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman,
Edmund Quincy, } Editors.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post-Office Department: "A postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Pro-Slavery.

From the Christian Freeman.

"THAT SAME OLD 'COON."

Edmund Quincy has come out, through the Anti-Slavery Standard, with his semi-annual attack upon Mr. Birney, for the purpose of helping the Whigs break down the Liberty party. He gave notice, some time ago, that he intended to show that Mr. Birney was the least unexceptionable candidate of the three. Well—the long-promised proof has made its appearance—and what, expectant reader, do you think it is? Simply a reiteration of the thousand times exploded fiction about the transfer of the Emancipator. This is too pitiful for mirth, and too ludicrous for serious comment. We took the trouble, some months ago, to give an impartial history of that affair to our readers, and do not think a reiteration of it necessary—but one thing we may remark, the truth of which even Edmund Quincy will hardly have the hardihood to deny. The part that Mr. Birney and the Executive Committee acted in that affair was warmly approved at the time by nine-tenths of the Abolitionists of the land. No unprejudiced person, with all the facts before him, would hesitate to say that the course of the Committee was legally and morally right. They owed it to the cause that the Emancipator should not go down—and every friend of rational abolitionism will thank them that, as a result of their judicious transfer of the paper, it was kept out of the hands of those who were bent upon making Abolition a stalking-horse for no-governmentism, no-churchism, and every other insane whim that Mr. Garrison and his party might choose to load it with.

The fact that Mr. Quincy brings out his compound of falsehood and stupidity, regularly, just on the eve of an important election, shows clearly the motive of his attack. It is evidently intended to aid the Whigs, in their efforts to elect a slaveholder to the Presidency. It is printed in a "Standard Extra," the word "Anti-Slavery" left off, to give it currency among pro-slavery Whigs, and is scattered by Whig *colporteurs* broadcast over the land. This was the game played in Massachusetts last fall, and the result was, that the Liberty vote in that State went up from 6,422 to 9,000. Let them pursue the same course this fall, and we shall expect a corresponding increase in the Liberty vote—for, thus far, every attempt to injure the fair fame of Mr. Birney, has recoiled upon the heads of those who have made it.

From the Liberty Press.

"STANDARD EXTRA."

Dr. Fussell, an agent for the American (Garrison) Anti-Slavery Society, is now in Central New-York. We know nothing of this man, any further than that he is an agent for a Society as hostile to the Liberty party as any political enemy that party has. He comes laden with the "Standard Extra," and is leaving them in his wake wherever he goes. The "Standard Extra" contains a most unworthy and libellous attack upon JAMES G. BIRNEY, concerning the matter of division in the ranks of the American Society four years ago. It is a repetition of the trick, by Edmund Quincy, played upon the country a year ago by David Lee Child. If Dr. F. in his mission for the slave, must aim a deadly blow at the reputation of ONE OF THE PUREST AND BEST OF MEN—a man that has sacrificed as much for conscience and for human freedom as any man on American soil—we have no countenance to give him! He must be a *mistaken* man, or a very *wicked* man! In either case, to "wish him God speed" is to be "partaker of his evil DEEDS!" Sad must be the fortunes of a Society that must break down the good name of JAMES G. BIRNEY to lift itself up.

We say to our friends, give no countenance to Dr. Fussell, and place no confidence in the falsehoods retailed by his Extra Standards.

Selections.

From "Truth's Advocate," published in Pawtucket, by Ray Potter.

CHARACTER OF JAMES G. BIRNEY, BY EDMUND QUINCY.

In the Anti-Slavery Standard of September 19th, Edmund Quincy has a long article on the character of James G. Birney. I think I have never read an article of equal length, that contained more of black calumny, cold-blooded, venomous slander, and lying, hypocritical *slang*, than this same article of the famous non-resistant, E. Q. And then it is done from such pure motives! Oh, yes, full of forgiveness he is, too.

I have been acquainted with the Anti-Slavery movement in this country from its origin. I was one of the Convention who assembled at Philadelphia, and organized the American Anti-Slavery Society. I was acquainted personally with almost all the leading men in the Society; and I know enough of the whole of the proceedings to which Quincy here alludes, to prove Mr. Birney, the Tappans, and others, defrauders in pecuniary matters, to perfectly satisfy *me*, that the whole of his charges on this ground, are nothing but slander. I wrote a communication for the Liberator, nearly a year ago, giving my views of this subject; but it was refused an insertion, and I have not yet been able to get it again.

No doubt this article of Quincy's will fatten Webb of the Courier & Enquirer, and others of the same taste; but in view of candid and disinterested men, who know Mr. Birney and the Tappans, it will have the effect to clothe the author with *deserved infamy*. I have not room in this place to enter into the merits of this question at all; but this much do I know, that if any man dares to dissent from the dogmas of a certain number in Boston, of which Edmund Quincy and Maria W. Chapman are leading spirits, they will be calumniated in a similar manner with Birney and his coadjutors. I give one specimen of this vile traducer's fairness and honesty in his *non-resistant*, loving, and forgiving article:

"There was a certain sum due for salaries and expenses to Mr. Birney, Mr. Stanton, and Mr. Lewis Tappan, amounting in all to *three thousand, nine hundred and ninety-five dollars, and ninety-eight cents*. ($3,995 98.) It was voted that this amount be paid to those gentlemen in publications, *at half the wholesale price*. Accordingly, they received for the amount aforesaid, ($3,995 98,) property worth, *at wholesale prices*, SEVEN THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-ONE DOLLARS, AND NINETY-SIX CENTS. (7,991 96.)!!!"

Now, Edmund Quincy means to make the impression, that these three men, in taking books at half the wholesale price, received double what was their due. "They received," he says, "for 3,995 98, property worth, at wholesale prices, SEVEN THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-ONE DOLLARS, AND NINETY-SIX CENTS." This he writes in small capitals, and ends it with three exclamations. Now, Edmund Quincy *knew*, when he penned this, that the very books which they received at one-half the NOMINAL wholesale price, could not have been sold for cash for *one-fourth* the said nominal wholesale price. I say he *knew* this—at least, he ought to have known it, or said nothing about it. Everybody who knows anything about it, knows the truth of what I here assert. Not but what the books were valuable books: but who would buy them? That's the question. They would not sell. Quincy must know this. I know it very well; for I had hundreds of the same kind of books; some of the very best, too, like Weld's "Slavery as it is," and I know I could not sell them. The plain *truth* is, therefore, that these men, in taking their pay in books, at what was *termed* one-half the wholesale price, did not get more than one-half the amount due them; and I doubt if they did as much; and yet this candid, forgiving, *un*-malicious writer represents them as taking double their due!

I ask any man of common sense, and common candor, to lpok at this. The truth is, the market had been supplied with these books before these men received them; and they lay on the shelves as dead property to the Society; there to remain, or *be given away*. These three men took them, as Quincy says, at one-half the nominal price; and I repeat it, in so doing, gave twice as much for them as they would have brought in any other way. This is a fair specimen of the honesty, fairness, and truth, of the whole of this despicable attempt of E. Q. to slander James G. Birney. "He (Birney) has betrayed the Anti-Slavery movement." That is, he refuses to wear the collar of Maria W. Chapman, Edmund Quincy, S. S. Foster, and Abby Kelley. Yes, he who refuses to kiss *their* great toes, betrays the movement. As long as one will wear the collar of these Boston aristocrats, he is "NOBLE HEARTED," but the moment he dares to be *free*, he "betrays the movement!!"

I have as good right to make *professions* as Edmund Quincy; and I here declare that what I here say, I say out of a sacred regard for truth and righteousness. If any men in this land have given evidence by their works, of being disinterested friends of the slave, they are these very men whom Quincy accuses of betraying the movement. Before Edmund Quincy was heard of in the Anti-Slavery cause, they jeopardized their earthly all *for* the movement; aye, their very lives. This I very well know. They poured out their property like water; they were mobbed, and for the truth's sake were counted the filth of the world; and yet EDMUND QUINCY insinuates that they have stolen dollars and cents from the *slave*, and made use of the money in their own speculations! When William L. Garrison was charged with *cheating* the lamented Knapp out of dollars and cents, my soul revolted at the charge, and I looked upon it with utter detestation; but that was *no more* slander than this infamous article of Edmund Quincy.

SKETCH OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—No. 1.

BY JOSHUA LEAVITT.

Several friends have expressed the opinion that a brief sketch of the American Anti-Slavery Society would afford the best answer to the slanders which the Clay and Garrison Abolitionists are circulating in regard to Mr. Birney and myself. I have thought it better to make it in the first person, as it is a matter of purely individual responsibility.

So far as I know, it is admitted by all who are conversant with the subject, that the present Anti-Slavery movement in this country, owes its origin to WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. I have always understood that Mr. Garrison received much advantage, in the commencement of his career, from the clear and uncompromising instructions of the venerable George Bourne; but the credit of setting on foot a general movement for the actual abolition of slavery, based on the simple principles of the inherent SINFULNESS OF SLAVEHOLDING, and the universal and absolute duty of IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION, so far as I know, is due to Mr. Garrison alone. It is a great honor that belongs to him, and of which neither the malice of enemies, nor the folly of friends, nor his own waywardness, can deprive him. Had he kept to the original platform, of moral *and political action;* had he been content to employ his labors with undivided zeal and singleness of purpose, for the abolition of slavery; had he been willing to be a fellow-laborer with those who adhered to their original purpose; his name would have remained at the head of the list of anti-slavery worthies, and would have been placed by posterity as much in advance of Clarkson and Wilberforce, as American Slavery is more firmly entrenched and more difficult of removal than that of the British islands.

The Anti-Slavery movement in New-York city was considerably later, in point of time, than Mr. Garrison's, and was, no doubt, indirectly a consequence of his labors. But it was originated and formed, and received its character and direction from men who never took their opinions or their plans in any way or shape from those of Mr. Garrison. Lewis Tappan, Wm. Goodell, Theodore D. Weld, and S. S. Jocelyn had studied out the Slavery Question for themselves; and so far as they derived suggestions from others, they had the benefit of George Bourne's instruction. Their movement was originated, planned, and consummated, while Mr. Garrison was absent in England; their first public meeting and the attendant mob taking place on the very day of his return. Their religious association and principles, their patriotic attachments, their views of the United States Constitution, were all different from Mr. Garrison's, and were in consonance with those of the general religious community of this country, and gave the New-York Committee an access and an influence among that class, which Mr. Garrison never sought, and never could have gained.

Although I had shared in the counsels of the New-York brethren from the early part of August, it was after the public meeting on the 3d of October, 1833, that the New-York Evangelist became openly and fully enlisted in the cause. Its circulation among the most zealous and active Christians, especially of the Presbyterian and Congregational denominations, at once carried the doctrines and motives of abolition to many thousands of the best minds and hearts in the country, and I have been repeatedly assured by Anti-Slavery agents, that the Evangelist, for a couple of years, made more abolition converts than all the lecturing agents. Wherever lecturers travelled, they said they were pretty sure of finding friends if they found a number of copies of the Evangelist circulated in the place.

Soon after the formation of the New-York Society, Mr. Garrison visited the Committee, and also went to Philadelphia, to consult on the formation of a National Society; but returned without effecting his object; indeed, under the conclusion that the time had not arrived for such a movement. A few days after, a worthy Quaker of Philadelphia, EVAN LEWIS, who was soon afterwards called to his rest, became deeply impressed with the necessity of a National Organization, and travelled to New-York and Boston on that errand, and finally succeeded in bringing the brethren in both places to favor his views for immediate action. A call was thereupon issued, and the National Anti-Slavery Convention held, at Philadelphia, on the 5th of December, 1833, which formed the American Anti-Slavery Society. When the question came up in regard to the location of the Executive Committee, so far as I ever heard, there was not the slightest difference of opinion. By common consent, it was located at New-York, and the individuals who already composed the Committee of the New-York Society, were chosen the Committee of the American Society. There was only one addition, the venerable Isaac T. Hopper, one of the most sincere and useful of men, but his modes of action did not fall in with the bold and go-ahead spirit of the rest of the Committee, and he soon resigned his place. The names of the Committee, as nearly as I recollect, were Arthur Tappan, William Goodell, John Rankin, William Green, Lewis Tappan, Abraham L. Cox, Elizur Wright, Jr. Joshua Leavitt, and Isaac T. Hopper. S. S. Jocelyn took Mr. Hopper's place. At the first anniversary, the number was enlarged to twelve, and the Rev'ds. Peter Williams, S. E. Cornish, and Theodore S. Wright, men of color, added. By subsequent removals and resignations, James G. Birney, D. Dunbar, L. R. Sunderland, and H. B. Stanton, filled the places of Messrs. Goodell, Green, Cox, and Wilkins. James S. Gibbons was chosen in place of D. Dunbar, in 1839, and Mr. Rankin resigned in the summer or autumn of that year.

The American Anti-Slavery Society, by its Constitution, was, and still is made up of all persons who assent to the principles of the Constitution, and contribute to the funds of the Society, and are not slaveholders.*

The business of the Society, organically, was appointed to be conducted in this manner: Those members of the Society who thought proper, or could make it convenient to attend the annual meeting, were authorized to choose a president, secretaries, treasurer, and such numbers of vice-presidents and managers as they might see proper. This, and the power of altering the Constitution in a certain mode, were all the specific acts which the Constitution empowers the attending members to perform in behalf of, and binding on the whole membership. These persons constituted a board of managers, five being a quorum, whose sole business was to elect an Executive Committee of not less than five, nor more than twelve members, to be located in New-York. The whole organic action of the Society was thus passed into the hands of the Executive Committee, who alone had power to act for and bind the Society, and whose powers for the purpose were of the broadest character.

They "shall have power to enact their own by-laws, fill any vacancy that may occur in their body, and in the offices of secretary and treasurer, employ agents, determine what compensation shall be paid to agents, and to the corresponding secretaries, direct the treasurer in the application of all moneys, and call special meetings of the Society. They shall make arrangements for all meetings of the Society, make an annual report of their doings, the income, expenditures, and funds of the Society, and shall hold stated meetings, and adopt the most energetic measures in their power to advance the objects of the Society."—*Art.* 6.

Here it will be seen that the whole working action of the Society was in the hands of the Committee. The Society had no hand to receive a single particle of property, no mouth to order the payment of a dollar from the treasury, no will to determine the salary of a single agent, no power to create or to direct a single publication, to hold or to dispose of the least item of property, to fill a vacancy, or to take any other measures "to advance the objects of the Society." All was in the hands of the Executive Committee. Whether this was a wise arrangement, I am not called to inquire, as I was not a member of the Convention which framed it. Suffice it to say, that no person ever moved an amendment to this provision, and that though the administration of the Society has been four years in the hands of Mr. Garrison and his friends, they have allowed it to remain as it was. Probably the extremely popular composition of the annual meeting, has been found so well balanced by the concentration of responsibility in the hands of the Committee when chosen, as to satisfy all parties. The only checks upon the Committee, (save their own discretion and fidelity,) are in the account which they have to render, the power of the Society to refuse them a re-election, and the power of each individual to cut off the supplies, by withholding his contributions. In truth, the Convention who first selected the Executive Committee, and whose selection was and is approved by the great body of Abolitionists, were satisfied to repose this trust as they did, because they knew the men.

But the best proofs of the utility of a system of machinery, is to see how it has worked. The Committee thus unanimously chosen, found themselves with a secretary to support, and a cause to carry on, but without resources, except among themselves. I ought to mention a donation of five hundred dollars from Isaac Winslow, and perhaps some few smaller sums were also contributed at the Convention. But it was understood that among the members of the Committee, were four men who were accustomed to the most liberal devotion of their ample resources for benevolent objects, and whose zeal in this new enterprise would lead them to concentrate a large share of their donations to this cause. These expectations were realized. I suppose that during the greater part of the four years succeeding the formation of the Society, the contributions of these four men to its treasury were not less than fifteen thousand dollars a year, besides other bountiful expenditures for the cause, which did not pass through the treasury.

If I recollect aright, the first business transacted by the new Committee was to receive and to respond to a pressing application for relief to the Liberator, to keep it from speedy death, which would have been deemed an ominous disaster in the commencement of our operations, because its name had become so much identified with the cause.

The required relief was cordially and unanimously afforded; and well is it now rewarding those who, at that crisis, averted from its conductors the death-chills of bankruptcy.

The Committee then commenced a system of operations upon a scale, and with a success, that transcended all the expectations of both friends and enemies. The issues of tracts and papers, in less than a year and a half, threw the whole South into a paroxysm of panic and revenge. The outbreaks of 1834–5–6 are but the evidences of the energy of their movements. Issuing half a million of publications yearly, and employing, one year, about seventy agents, forming auxiliary societies in States, counties, towns, and neighborhoods, to the number of fifteen hundred in all, of which twelve were State Societies, in a little over four years; moving all the great religious and ecclesiastical bodies of the land, and convulsing Congress, and nearly every State Legislature; there can be hardly a doubt that if their operations could have been sustained, both by pecuniary resources and the harmonious co-operation of the whole Anti-Slavery strength of the country, at the pitch they held on the 4th anniversary of the Society's formation, Dec. 5, 1837, slavery would at this day have been tottering to its fall, if not already in the process of dissolution.

So satisfactory was the administration of the Committee, for the wisdom of their plans, the energy of their movements, and the success of their labors, that even Mr. Garrison's society, which, under its name of "New England Anti-Slavery Society," maintained a sort of Rhode Island independence for a considerable time, was at length led to change its organization to that of a State auxiliary. Whether this was done from a single desire to strengthen the general movement, or was influenced in any degree by a fear of speedy absorption, or a calculation for the destructive game that was afterwards played, need not now be inquired. Suffice it to say, that for about four years, there was perfect unity in the Anti-Slavery phalanx, and its labors were attended with marvellous success. The original committee, with only the changes that time had made, was re-elected six times, and always with entire unanimity, until the last time, in 1839, when Messrs. Garrison and Phillips voted in the negative in the Board of Managers.

I speak the more freely of the doings of the Committee, from the fact that a very large part of their most energetic movements were made at times when, from my engagements as editor and reporter of public meetings, it was out of my power to be a regular attendant at their meetings. I do not believe there ever was a committee in this country that for five years devoted so much and so valuable time, and at the same time made such liberal donations of money, as that Committee.

If I were to date the first beginning of division, it was in the local controversy that arose in Massachusetts in connection with the "Clerical Appeal." Mr. Garrison here made it apparent that he intended to coerce the whole body of Abolitionists to take part in his personal quarrel, and thus sanction the notion, that for any one to oppose his dictation, or to censure his vagaries, was "disloyal"—that was his word, and thus establish the claim that he was abolition—just as Napoleon claimed that he was France. And because the National Committee acted on their own judgment, and refused to bring the whole movement to a stand-still to avenge his personal griefs, he turned against them, with a hatred, which, (though of late expressed chiefly through his friends,) is apparently the less satisfied as its impotence becomes more apparent.

It were painful, and perhaps needless, to detail the steps of a series of machinations, all successively defeated, by which it was sought to embarrass the Committee in such a way as to lead them to barter away, for peace, the rights of their constituents to be represented by a committee who would act on their own judgment, and not at the dictation of a self-exalted dictator. It was a sad controversy, and grievously are three millions of slaves bearing the consequences.

At length, finding all other means ineffectual, Mr. Garrison and his supporters, non-resistants, as they call themselves, resorted to physical force, and by extraordinary means procured about five hundred persons, (the greater part believed not to be constitutionally entitled to membership, as not contributing to the funds of the society,) who came to New-York at the annual meeting in May, 1840, and by the mere animal strength of numbers, without argument or suasion of any kind, forcibly took possession of the Society, and appropriated its name, and as far as they could, its influence, to objects quite foreign to its original design, and to the will of the great body of its members.

It will be borne in mind that the society *consists* of all who come within the terms of membership in the Constitution. The business of receiving the report of the Executive Committee, and making the election of officers and managers, is entrusted to those members who may be in actual attendance at the meeting. Yet, for a large number of actual members to collude together, for a local or party purpose, to wrest the society, by the mere force of numbers, from the course which it had uniformly maintained with the consent of the great body of members, was neither more nor less than a fraud consummated under the forms of law, and entitled the conspirators to claim nothing, certainly, beyond that of which they had thus surreptitiously obtained possession.

Want of space compels this article to close here until to-morrow, when I propose to show the situation in which this violent movement found and left the old Executive Committee, and also, to show by the result, that the doings of the invaders were never ratified, but instantly rejected by the great body of the members of *the* American Anti-Slavery Society; so that, although the captors have never been disturbed, in what they got for booty, they never were recognized as being the real society, whose footsteps had shaken the continent; but that the influence and character of that body have since been developed under other forms of action.

NO. II.

The proof is complete, that the old Committee, up to the time of this invasion of the Society by a steamboat load of persons, (mostly having no constitutional right of membership,) had continued to represent the views and conform to the wishes of the body of the Society; and that those who wrested the Society out of the hands of its legitimate representatives, (those members who might attend for the *ordinary* business of the annual meeting,) *did not represent the Society* itself, and *did not conform to the will of the Society.*

A conclusive proof is, that the great body of those who were members, from that hour have withdrawn all support from the new Committee. For a short time, the paroxysm of party triumph seemed to bring funds into their treasury; and thus enabled them to set up a newspaper representing Mr. Garrison's views—not those ever entertained or countenanced by the real, original American Anti-Slavery Society. But this kind of support is short-lived, and they have gone on, reducing their expenditures, step by step, to the lowest point; and have been obliged to remove the location of the Committee, from the sheer impossibility of organizing such a Committee as they dare to trust, in New-York. While more money is now spent for abolition purposes, than was done in the palmiest days of the old Society; the confidence and support of those who formerly upheld that Society, is wholly withdrawn from the new Committee, and is yet continued, in other forms, to the members and agents of the old Committee

Another proof is, in the open withdrawment of the State auxiliaries, representing the body of Abolitionists of all the free States. The State Societies of Maine, Connecticut, New-York, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, formally withdrew. Those of New Hampshire and Massachusetts were divided, and those which took the great body of supporters of the American Society, renounced their auxiliaryship. Of Vermont and Pennsylvania, my recollection is not quite clear, but for practical purposes, Vermont and Western Pennsylvania are entirely withdrawn. It is matter of notoriety that the name of the American Anti-Slavery Society represented thenceforth, a totally different thing from what it had before designated. Consequently the removal of the old officers was not, in any sense, a condemnation of their conduct *by their constituents*, or by those who had originally placed them or subsequently supported them in office.

A word now in regard to the situation of the Committee. At the annual meeting of 1839, after the attempt of Mr. Garrison to eject the old Committee, which was sustained only by his own vote and that of Wendell Phillips, GERRIT SMITH, who then sympathized, on many points, with Mr. G. made a donation to the Society, of ten thousand dollars. This, and the apparent indications of returning prosperity to the country, encouraged the Committee to resolve to make an effort to raise and expend one hundred thousand dollars, during the year. They laid their plans of operation accordingly, intending to employ a large part of their resources in the western States. As the circulation of books and tracts, and the formation of free Anti-Slavery libraries, was then a highly popular mode of operation, they proceeded to lay in an ample stock for this purpose.

Before they had got ready to make collections, however, the transient signs of commercial prosperity failed; the "Land, ho!" of the Journal of Commerce turned to Cape Flyaway, and a general scarcity of money greatly embarrassed the finances. Another cause was found in the rising fever of political excitement, which, even in the summer of 1839, had turned off thousands of zealous Abolitionists to the Presidential warfare. The Albany Convention of the first of August, 1839, strongly developed this state of things.

In the course of the year, especially after the "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" songs began to be sung, the extreme anxiety of political men to hush up the Anti-Slavery movement so far as it might in any way embarrass their party objects, become intense and uncompromising. From these two causes, chiefly, the pecuniary embarrassment and the political excitement, the Committee failed to make such collections as they had anticipated, and before they could curtail their expenditures accordingly, they had gone deeply in debt.

When the Garrisonian party gave out word that they intended to depose the Committee, the hint was given in the "Non-Resistant," then one of their mouth-pieces, that in taking possession of the Society, they did not intend to pay these debts. For the greater part of these debts, as for office rent, fuel, paper, printing, clerk hire, &c. the members of the Committee were personally liable, and have paid every dollar out of their own pockets. True to their warning, and in great consistency with their other conduct, those who seized upon the Society HAVE NEVER OFFERED TO PAY ONE DOLLAR OF THESE DEBTS!

Forewarned, however, the Committee had the precaution to put the property in their possession—the very property for which these debts were incurred, into the hands of trustees, to be disposed of, and the proceeds applied to the debts. But with all the diligence of the trustees, who were themselves, large creditors, so great was the change of things produced by the breaking up of the old Society, and the altered style of operations that followed, that they were never able to realize more than two or three thousand dollars, (I write from memory,) from the sale of effects inventoried at five or six times that amount. The remainder of the business debts they have paid out of their own funds—no member of the Garrison party offering a dollar. The old Committee, I think, have paid above eight thousand dollars for the Society, since its capture.

This is a sufficient answer to Mr. Edmund Quincy's great story about "assets," then at the disposal of the Committee, "standing in their own books, at more than eighteen thousand dollars." These "assets" were not then available to the Committee, to relieve them of their personal obligations, incurred in behalf of the Society, for any sum whatever. Not one dollar could be raised upon them for business purposes. The only way in which they procured money at the close of the year, was through an individual, who, for the love of the cause, advanced some hundreds of dollars on a transfer of books. This person had views of his own, and would only advance money for such objects as pleased him—as he had an undoubted right to do. I am informed that the books he received, have never yielded him one dollar—except in the satisfaction he had in their gratuitous distribution.

The Garrison party, during all this period of embarrassment, while the Committee were laboriously carrying the Society through such difficulties, never lifted a finger to aid them, either by donations or loans, but did all in their power to prevent any aid coming to them from any quarter. And yet these people now pretend to censure the Committee for not doing more! They could do no more. They could not continue the Emancipator, because the person from whom alone they could procure money, *was opposed to the Emancipator*, and would not advance money for its support.

The necessity of going to press early, in order to accommodate our large edition of weekly Emancipator, now nearly nineteen thousand, prevents a further exposition to-day. I have shown that, so far as the general prosperity of the Society was concerned, the Committee acted in good faith, and under a heavy responsibility; and that the only wrong done, was by those who seized upon the Society, and left the Committee to pay the debts.

In regard to the Emancipator, I shall show hereafter, that that was in the hands of the Committee in the same way with all the rest of the property; that it was transferred, for all it was worth, in a business way; that in all this there was no wrong done to any one by the Committee, except to myself; that if they failed in any respect in point of wisdom, it was not owing to any unfair motives towards the Garrison party, but if any, towards the Liberty party; that Mr. Birney's participation was no more than that of any other member of the Committee; that his salary was no greater than was usually paid in New-York for such services, and that his whole conduct in relation to the Society, was eminently disinterested and honorable.

* "Any person who consents to the principles of this Constitution, who contributes to the funds of this Society, and is not a slaveholder, may be a member of this Society, and shall be entitled to vote at its meetings."—*Constitution, Art.* 4.

REPORT OF THE NEW-YORK DELEGATES.

The Report of the undersigned, delegates from the City and County of New-York, to the Convention for the extension of Elective Franchise, held at Schenectady, September 18th, 1844, respectfully sheweth,—

That in obedience to instructions received at an adjourned meeting of the citizens of the city and county of New-York, held September 16th, 1844, at Union Hall, 101 Anthony street, and furnished with funds placed by that meeting in the hands of the Chairman of the delegation, your delegates proceeded to Schenectady, and on the morning of the 18th of September went to the Baptist Church; in which, at 10 o'clock A. M. the Convention was opened, without prayer, and having elected R. Francis, of Rochester, Chairman, it proceeded to business.

The morning session was occupied by the adoption of one Resolution (relating to the Franchise) and the discussion of a second Resolution of like character.

The afternoon session was opened without prayer; two letters, by a vote of the House, were read to the Convention: the first, from Rev. T. S. Wright, of New-York, urging the Convention, if it took sides with any party, to go for the Liberty Party; the second was from Rev. C. B. Ray, of New-York, who, calling himself as delegate elect (which was not true) urged the same course upon the Convention; both the letter writers deprecated any party movement by the Convention. Appended to the last letter was a Protest,* which, after some debate on the propriety of its being read, was referred to the Business Committee.

The Chairman of the Business Committee announced as next in order the following—

THE PROTEST

Of the undersigned colored citizens of the city and county of New-York, assembled on the 16th of September, 1844, to send Delegates to the Convention of the citizens of New-York, to be held at Schenectady, September 18th, for the purpose of obtaining an extension of the elective franchise; respectfully Sheweth; that

Whereas, at the State Convention held at Rochester, August 22d, 1843, for the purpose of obtaining the same object, the following Resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved, That the Whig party, and the Democratic party, so called, the latter having positively refused, the other neglected to go to the extent of their ability to place those they had unrighteously proscribed upon a common level, politically, with other citizens, have both showed themselves unworthy the countenances and suffrages of the true friends of equal liberty, and the proscribed class themselves cannot vote with either without directly giving their own power and influence against themselves and their brethren universally.

"Resolved, That in going to the polls to vote, we will in no case whatever, vote with either of the pro-slavery parties of the land, since that would be, in our judgment, giving our suffrages against ourselves."

We do solemnly protest against the adoption of the above Resolutions by the Convention of 1843, and also against the adoption of any resolutions of kindred spirit, by the Convention about to assemble at Schenectady—

1st. Because the Convention of 1843 having assembled to take measures to obtain an extension of the elective franchise—a specific object—had no right to adopt resolutions extraneous, or detrimental to that object.

2d. Because the constituents of that Convention, being attached to no *one* political party, and therefore opposed to no other one political party, the Convention had no right, without previous notice to its constituents, to pass resolutions which, directly or indirectly, identify its constituents with any political party.

3d. Because the above resolutions place the success of the attempts to obtain an extension of the franchise upon the success of a *party* which must ever comprise but a portion of the people, instead of relying upon the will and magnanimity of the whole people.

4th. Because the Convention, by assuming an attitude hostile to two political parties, thereby places itself, and those whom it assumed in this matter to represent, in the position of men asking from two political parties the power, to enable them to overthrow those parties—whilst the truth is, we seek the elective franchise, not for the purpose of upholding one party and prostrating another, but we ask it in good faith, as good citizens, feeling our capacity to enjoy that great privilege, and our determination to exercise it for the best interests of the *whole people*, without regard to sect or party.

Resolved, That the above Protest be signed by the Chairman and Secretary on behalf of this meeting, and that the delegates from this city be requested to present the above protest to the Convention, with the request that it may be recorded upon the minutes of the Convention."

In behalf of the meeting.
JEREMIAH POWERS, Chairman.
JAMES M'CUNE SMITH, Secretary.

The Protest having been read to the Convention, James M'Cune Smith, of the city of New-York, moved, "That the Protest be accepted, and recorded upon the minutes of the Convention." In support of this motion, he stated the facts in the case, to wit: "That the minutes of the Rochester Convention had not been read before any meeting of the citizens of New-York, until the evening of September 16th, 1844: that at the meetings held in that city, immediately after the adjournment of the Convention held at Rochester, the people of New-York city had, by a large majority, negatived a resolution of the same import with those objected to in the Protest; and that the earliest meeting at which the Rochester resolutions were read, had now protested against them: the protesters firmly believing that the said resolutions were not relevant to the franchise, took this means of recording their sentiments—sentiments which did not affect the inherent truth or falsehood of the Resolutions, but simply their relevancy."

Rev. H. H. GARNETT, of Troy, opposed the Resolution to accept and record the Protest: first, because the Resolutions protested against were, in themselves true; secondly, because, according to the statement of the mover, the Protest had been adopted at a small meeting; thirdly, because the Convention at Schenectady had no connection whatever with the Convention at Rochester, each Convention being independent and finishing its own work without appeal. He further said, that if the Protest had been signed by two individuals, he would have permitted it to be recorded."

Mr. THOMPSON, of Albany, advocated the reception and record of the Protest; because, the colored people seek the franchise, as a boon, from the whole people, not from any party or portion of the people. He illustrated the absurdity of a contrary course, by the following fact, which was not denied, viz: That the Convention at Rochester had passed a Resolution, "instructing the General Committee to wait on the Governor, and request him to make favorable mention of the extension of the franchise to the people of color, in his annual message:" that when the Central Committee waited on Governor Bouck, his Excellency stated his willingness to comply with their request, in case he found sufficient reason in the *minutes of the Convention*, which he requested the committee to bring to him. But the Chairman of the Central Committee (Rev. Mr. Garnett of Troy) could not be prevailed on to carry the minutes to the Governor, although frequently urged to do so. "And why?" said Mr. Thompson, "because those very minutes denounced the party to which Governor Bouck belonged."

WILLIAM P. JOHNSON, of New-York, opposed the motion, and hoped that the Protest would be crushed beneath the feet of the Convention, because it was an unrighteous proceeding: the meeting which adopted it, was an illegal meeting, having been made an adjourned meeting at the end of the previous one, when everybody, almost, had gone away.

ULYSSES B. VIDAL, of New-York, urged the reception and record of the Protest; because New-York city having been misrepresented at the Rochester Convention, had undoubted right to record her sentiments in regard to the resolutions against which she protested, at this the very first and most fitting opportunity; he further (after eliciting from Mr. Johnson that his statement in regard to the adjournment was made upon hearsay) stated that he (Mr. V.) had been Chairman of the meeting in question, and that the adjournment had been legally made while the body of the meeting was yet in session: he further held, that this Convention having been appointed to be held at Schenectady by the Rochester Convention, was, therefore, the creation of the Rochester Convention, was in strict connection with it, and had a right to review its doings.

Mr. MOULTON, of Troy, objected to the Resolution to accept the Protest; because this Convention had no right to review the proceedings of the previous Convention.

WILLIAM P. POWELL, of New-York, advocated the reception of the Protest, on the ground that it would enable this Convention to regain the confidence lost and thrown away by the last, in the false step which it had taken. He dwelt upon the inconsistency of the colored people in identifying themselves with a political party to obtain the Elective Franchise in 1844, when they had already lost the Franchise, by a similar false movement in 1821.

J. M'CUNE SMITH, of New-York, said that the debate had taken too wide a range. The question before the Convention was, shall we grant the request of the citizens of New-York, and record their Protest, or shall we not? If the Convention accepted the Protest, it did not adopt its sentiments, it simply granted to the people of New-York the right to be heard, granted their respectful request—their petition. If the Convention rejected the Protest, it rejected the request of the people of New-York, denied their right to be heard, violated the sacred right of petition and remonstrance.

Rev. H. H. GARNETT, of Troy, moved that the Convention do adjourn, to meet at 7 o'clock, P. M. which was carried.

During this debate, the number of delegates present did not exceed twenty-five.

During the interval, at the invitation of Mr. Rich, of Troy, your delegates partook at a splendid *Soirée*, at which were present about one hundred ladies from that city.

The session having been opened with prayer, Rev. H. H. Garnett, of Troy, again opposed the reception of the Protest; he admitted the strength of the position that a rejection of the Protest would be a violation of the Right of Petition: but held that to be a false statement of the present case, and a statement which had been assumed by the cunning of the delegates from New-York, (he was here called to order and retracted the word cunning:) he insisted that the Protest was not a fair issue and that it must be rejected.

J. M'CUNE SMITH, of New-York, said that the opposition having admitted the strength of the position occupied by those who urged the reception of the Protest, it was useless to debate the question further: it remained with the Convention to admit or reject the right of the citizens of New-York to record their sentiments respectfully expressed—"to admit or deny the right of petition."

The question being put, the Convention by a vote of 11 ayes and 38 noes, refused to accept or record the Protest.

Of the 49 votes cast, about 33 were from Schenectady and Troy, nearly all in the negative: thus these two places, with a joint total colored population of less than 1,000 rejected the petition of New-York, containing 20,000 free colored people.

Immediately upon the announcement of this vote, U. B. Vidal, W. B. Powell, and James M'Cune Smith, of New-York, rose—the first two tendered their resignations as members of the Business Committee, and all tendered their resignations as members of the Convention, each giving his reasons for taking this step; the resignations were accepted by the Convention.

In taking the very decided step of withdrawing from the deliberations of the convention, your delegates respectfully submit, that they were fully warranted by the facts in the case. Having been honored, fellow-citizens, with your appointment of us as your representatives in the State Convention, we accepted this distinguished trust with a full sense of its importance and responsibility; with a firm determination to present to the convention such matter as you in your judgment should think proper to trust to our care, to express what we firmly believed to be your sentiments, and to maintain for you that unyielding regard for your rights which has ever distinguished the people of the city of New-York.

Fellow-citizens! you had entrusted us with a document, a Protest, respectfully worded, and accompanied with a respectful request that it might be recorded upon the minutes of the Convention. This request was rejected by the Convention! Had it been a request to reject or adopt the sentiments of the Protest, it would have been another matter; for then, the Convention would have been urged to adopt the sentiments of a meeting of the citizens of New-York; and a refusal to adopt would have been an expression of a difference of opinion. But a refusal to *accept* and record the Protest, was a refusal to record the sentiments of that meeting. It was a denial of the right of the people of New-York, assembled at a public meeting, to record their sentiments upon the minutes of the Convention—sentiments which were expressed in regard to the only object which the Conv

means by which this deliberate, premeditated insult was consummated, but they are in themselves irrelevant to the issue which alone remains before the people of New-York.

Your delegates might have borne with indignity and insult in the hope that by remaining in the Convention they might yet, in their humble way, have contributed to the great object—the extension of the Elective Franchise, for the attainment of which they were sent to labor. But your delegates were now convinced that by the rejection of the Protest from New-York the Convention deprived itself of the only means by which it could continue to labor for the Franchise. *So long as the Resolutions adopted at Rochester*, (against which the city of New-York had protested,) *remain recorded as the sentiments of the colored people of the State of New-York, so long will it be utterly useless for the people of color to strive for the extension to them, on equal terms, of the Elective Franchise!* Because the Rochester Convention's Resolutions identify the people of color with one political party, they promise the votes of people of color to that party, and that party only: they therefore change the ground of our effort, instead of asking for a *right* based upon the highest principles of general good, they ask for a *means* by which to help into power certain political aspirants who have made specious promises, thus confirming the charge which has been urged against the people of color, that their votes could be bought for a price.

Believing, that, by a refusal to second your Protest, the Convention had not only poured insult upon you, but had also destroyed the only mode by which it could effect anything towards extension of the Franchise, your delegates knew that their opportunity for successful labor had passed away, and they resigned their membership of the Convention.

Fellow-citizens! believing that you are unwilling that your sentiments in regard to the propriety of keeping aloof from political partisanship the great question of the Franchise, shall be misrepresented at one Convention, and that your right to be heard shall be denied by another Convention; believing that you are unwilling that you shall be handed over, bound hand and foot, to one political party, no matter which; believing that you are unwilling that your ancient and unwavering determination to be heard in whatever concerns your welfare, shall at this late day be crushed and trampled upon—we respectfully, but fearlessly submit our conduct in this matter, to your decision; assured, whatever the decision may be, that we will continue to labor along with you to obtain that priceless boon, that glorious privilege, that last, best RIGHT OF FREEMEN, the enjoyment of the Elective Franchise! A right, our only safe claim to which can be based upon our bringing to the altar of the Empire State, and of our common country, an independence in thought, an intelligence in opinion, a devotedness in patriotism, a sternness of integrity, which shall be above, or at least, equal to, the standard occupied by those of our fellow-citizens who now do vote.

With great respect,
ULYSSES B. VIDAL,
JAMES M'CUNE SMITH,
Delegates from the city of N. Y. to the State Convention, held at Schenectady, Sept. 18th, 1844.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM JAMES G. BIRNEY.

HAMDEN, Conn. Oct. 10, 1844.

To the Editor of the Tribune:

I have just now seen in the Tribune of to-day, an article headed "Coalition of James G. Birney with the Polk party." The charge of coalition rests on the fact, that I have been nominated for the Legislature of Michigan by a Democratic Convention, and that I assented to its being done.

The following is all, of substance, that is necessary to explain the transaction:

During my absence from home, last year, in New-England, it was proposed in the WHIG Convention, of the county in which I reside, to nominate me for the Legislature. The nomination, however, was not made, on the ground, as I was informed, that I might not be willing to serve if elected, and that the county, in that event, would be put to the trouble and expense of holding another election. Being asked, on my return, whether I would have served had I been elected, I replied that I would; that as every voter in the county knew that I was an Abolitionist—a member of the Liberty party, and opposed to both the other parties—for I had used every proper occasion, publicly and privately, to expose their unfaithfulness—I would regard my election as coming from the *people*, irrespective of party.

Last Spring and Summer, complaints of mismanagement on the part of the county authorities were made by the people of the county. I thought the complaints were just. The persons most implicated were of both the Whig and Democratic parties. A public meeting was held to take into consideration the charges. I presented the facts of the case to the meeting, and supported a set of resolves embodying the sentiments of the meeting in relation to them. The course I took met with the approbation of those who were present, and of those who were not—excepting, very likely, the parties implicated and their near friends.

The same evening, I reviewed, before a large assembly, embracing nearly all who had been in the county meeting, just mentioned, the course of the Democratic and Whig parties, as connected with the cause of human liberty,—with the just claims of the North, and the integrity of the Constitution. This review could, of course, be nothing else than severe: yet, no one, save it might be the party managers, found fault with it; and this, because the facts were true—the treatment candid and impartial.

It was after this that the wish was expressed by persons of both parties that I should represent the county in the Legislature. I was applied to, to say that I would serve if elected. My uniform answer (from whatever quarter the application came) was, that if the people of the county, with the full knowledge which they possessed of my opinions, wished me to serve them, I would do it. I told them moreover, that I should regard my election as proof that the people intended to put an end to the pernicious party contests, by which their own peace and the interests of the county had been so long marred.

Although I have been nominated by my Democratic neighbors, no one in the county would have spoken of me as of that party had not the cue been given by the wire-workers of the Whig party—especially by the originator of the coalition story, the Detroit Advertiser, a priat that has spared neither fact nor fiction to win over the Liberty party in Michigan to the support of the Whigs, by weakening their confidence in me. A specimen of this recklessness may be seen in the statement transferred to The Tribune—*that if my conference with General Hascall at Flint, were divulged, it would doubtless disclose, that my mission to the East was undertaken at the instance of the Locofocos, as well as leading Abolitionists of New-York, though cloaked under the pretence of a visit to my son, residing in Connecticut.* I neither saw General Hascall when I was at Flint, nor have I ever exchanged with him a dozen words on any matter of party politics. This is all fiction. Whatever I have done has been done openly; and I absolve from every obligation of secrecy all persons with whom I have conversed on matters pertaining to public men or party measures.

Part of the article in The Tribune is a letter signed by A. P. Davis, of Flint, in Michigan. He professes to have discovered the clue to my "inveterate hostility" to Mr. Clay, in the aforesaid nomination, and in the fact of my first marriage having been into the Marshall family. Now it turns out that my first marriage was not into the Marshall family, and that that family, in Kentucky, are, with but two exceptions, so far as I have heard, favorable to the election of Mr. Clay. The charge of inveterate hostility to Mr. Clay—if it mean anything more than political opposition—is wholly imaginary. I have no reasons for opposing Mr. Clay on personal grounds. On the contrary, the intercourse we have had has been of the most friendly character. I oppose his election, because he disbelieves the great political truths of the Declaration of Independence, the foundation of all just Government, and because he repudiates the paramount object of the UNION, the perpetuation of Liberty to all. On the same ground I oppose the election of Mr. Polk. But I more deprecate the election of Mr. Clay—because, possessing abilities superior to Mr. Polk's, he would proportionally weaken the influence of those truths on the minds of our countrymen.

Respectfully, &c.
JAMES G. BIRNEY.

P. S. The only direct information I have had respecting this nomination has been conveyed to me by a member of the Whig party residing at Saginaw in a letter just received. His language shows that my nomination to the Legislature is not owing to *party* attachment. He says, "I think you may make up your mind to spend this winter in Detroit, for this seems to be the wish of a good number of both parties."

LATE FROM TEXAS.—Dr. *Anson Jones*, Anti-Annexation candidate is elected President. Commodore Jones is acquitted.

Communications.

LETTER FROM ISAAC S. FLINT.

WILMINGTON, September 21st, 1844.

Friend Gay:—The campaign against Slavery has fairly opened, in this State. And with a reasonable prospect of Abolitionists being able to do something too. The Wilmington meeting, mentioned in last Standard, was not the first one held in Delaware. It was the first public one in this city, but quite a number have been held along the northern border of the State. I have just returned from a short tour, having held three meetings lower down in the State, than any one has ever gone before, except Lucretia Mott. So far as my experience goes, the "wickedness of slaveholding," and "Anti-Slavery pure and proper," can be discussed with as much safety here, as in Pennsylvania; aye, more. I have been mobbed repeatedly in that State, but never in this; though I have spoken the truth in much plainness. We have a State Society recently organized; and intend to agitate as much as possible during the coming fall and winter. It will take a thunderbolt of Anti-Slavery truth to rouse the people, for Whig and Democratic Christians here are steeped to the lips in the infamy of "selling the bodies and souls of men"—of selling poor helpless women into the tender mercies of Southern Slavery, for imitating by some act of petty larceny their lordly oppressors, who daily steal them body and soul—of fining, imprisoning, and selling men for feeding the hungry and clothing the naked (fugitive from injustice)—and of various minor acts of tyranny to the colored man and his friends. God speed the day when such Democracy and such Christianity shall be known only as a bye-word, and a hissing in all the earth.

A word concerning the "No-Voting Theory." Though a non-voter and a disunionist myself, yet I am constrained to believe, after investigating the subject to some extent, that no such revolution as Wendell Phillips contemplates, can ever be effected by believers in force. I know that our fathers fought seven years for the right of the people to overthrow governments by force; and I know too that the theory of republican Governments gives the majority a right to rule the minority, "peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must." But I apprehend that the men of the revolution would not have fought could they have had access to the ballot-box to redress their grievances. And not one in ten of their sons will admit the right to revolutionize by rebellion, while the ballot-box is open to them. In regard to taking the oath to support the Constitution, men will be likely either to think the Constitution Anti-Slavery, or they will contend, as does friend Earle, that the election of an Abolitionist would be a virtual amendment of it: as an Abolitionist, if elected to office, will stand pledged to do nothing to support Slavery. It is immaterial what is the exact letter of the Constitution, if there is an Anti-Slavery administration of it. To me the conclusions to which Thomas Earle comes in drawing his parallels between suing and importing goods (both voluntary acts) on the one hand, and voting on the other, are irresistible. I think there is no difference, morally, between using and sanctioning the Government, voluntarily, for our own comfort, and voting under it for the liberation of the slave. True, we must not continue to do one immoral act (vote) to support Government, because we find that we are doing several other immoral acts in support of it. Non-voters should be consistent in their opposition to this pro-slavery Government; but to refrain from suing, and using imported goods, would be so inconvenient, that I apprehend but few persons will be found to do so. Most people, seeing themselves inconsistent in these things, will prefer to be so also in voting, by which, they expect to promote the abolition of Slavery. But I am far from being convinced that the way to abolish Slavery, is to vote for its overthrow. Slavery, I apprehend, will exist as long as the present corrupt public opinion, in regard to it, exists, and no longer. It appears to me that all such as believe in force and political machinery to destroy evil, ought to work in that way for the overthrow of Slavery, until they are convinced there is higher ground to take. I think it important that men should labor for the right, even if they do not see the best way to do it. Better labor to destroy Slavery in an objectionable way, than to help the oppressor in any way.

Such a revolution as is contemplated by individuals withdrawing themselves from the Government until they are a majority, and then setting up a Government by force over the minority, who have constitutions, laws, armies, and navies on their side, seems to me impossible, except in theory, and if once effected, subject to endless changes and revolutions.

The progressive nature of man will never allow him to be long satisfied with one set of laws and constitutions. It seems to me, then, that the true way to labor for Abolition, is to create as soon as possible a public sentiment that shall loathe Slavery with a perfect loathing. When there is such a public sentiment, all, who believe in the sacredness of human Governments, will be likely to carry their hatred of Slavery to the polls, and vote against it. While all Non-Resistants will labor, not only for the dissolution of this blood-cemented Union, but for the destruction of all Governments of force.

Yours, &c.
ISAAC. S. FLINT.

LETTER FROM JAMES FULTON, JR.

ERCILDOUN, Chester Co. Pa.
9th mo. 29th, 1844.

FRIEND GAY:—To the testimony adduced in my last, to demonstrate the determined attachment of Henry Clay to Slavery and its interests, I might add his speech about two years ago in Richmond, Indiana, addressed to one Mendenhall and others, who had petitioned him to give freedom to his slaves. I know many well-disposed persons, catching up Clay's representation of the transaction in that speech, were ready to censure the petitioners for availing themselves of such a public occasion to prefer their petition, while the masses denounced the proceeding as outraging the rules of hospitality; but when the facts in the case are known, the whole matter appears in a very different light—not designing however to imply, that the course attributed to them would have been wrong, for I hold the contrary. The petition, then, instead of having been signed, as Clay would have made the impression, by blacks, a few women and children, was subscribed by about *two* thousand (if memory does not greatly fail me,) of the most respectable citizens of that neighborhood; and a committee of the signers sought an opportunity privately, the day preceding the one on which he was to address the citizens, to present it to him, but he declined receiving it—stating that he would prefer receiving it on the morrow, in the presence of "his fellow-citizens," when he would take occasion to make somewhat of a general reply to it. At *his request*, the petition *was so presented*, and then he tried to make capital out of the circumstance, by feigning to be exceedingly hurt and insulted, at the public manner in which the petitioners had sought to call his attention to the subject.

Hear an extract or two from that speech. "Excuse me, Mr. Mendenhall, for saying that my slaves are as well fed and clad, look as sleek and hearty, and are quite as civil and respectful in their demeanor, and as little disposed to *wound* the feelings of any one, *as you are*." "Go home, and mind your own business, and leave other people to take care of theirs. Limit your benevolent exertions to your own neighborhood, within that circle you will find ample scope for the exercise of all charities." "And you will be a better and wiser man, than you have this day shown yourself."

We have the testimony of J. Cannings Fuller, a man of well-known veracity, who visited Ashland since, or a short time prior to the delivery of that speech, that some of Clay's "well fed," and "sleek" *men and women* "stock," had not floors to their huts, as good as his, (Fuller's,) horses had.

I know that some of my friends have complained, and of course his partisans generally, that we should be quoting at *this* time, sentiments which he uttered *years ago*, and which he may have repudiated ere this—that his old age may have wrought changes in his opinions; and that his gray hairs have no sympathy with his past notions. True, such may be the case sometimes, and if such be the fact in Clay's case, we have been doing him gross injustice. Let us see how the matter stands—so late, at least as "*September 2d*, 1844."

In his Raleigh speech, delivered in April last, and during his visit to that city, in which he wrote his first letter on Annexation,—he declares that "On the subject of Abolition, I am persuaded it is not necessary to say one word to this enlightened assemblage. My opinion was *fully expressed* in the Senate of the United States a few years ago, and the expression of it, was one of the *assigned causes* of my not receiving the nomination as a candidate for the Presidency in December, 1839. But if there be *any* one who *doubts*, or desires to obtain further information about my views in respect to that unfortunate question, I refer him to Mr. Mendenhall, of Richmond, Indiana."

Notwithstanding this very recent avowal, of still holding the atrocious sentiments of his Senate speech, quoted in my last, some were ready to hope that he had changed since then. Yes! so anxious were they to hope good things, that they had really hoped themselves into the realization in their own minds, that he would actually free every slave he had the moment he should be elected President. C. M. Clay, his near relative, was so full of this feeling, that he ventured to declare in a letter to Col. J. J. Speed, of Ithaca, N. Y. dated July 10th, 1844, that "I do not mean to say that Mr. Clay is an Emancipationist—*but I believe his feelings are with the cause. but I know that those most immediately within his influence approximate to myself on the subject of Slavery.*"

Well, this surmise—this guess—this hope, which some how or other had actually grown into reality on the part of C. M. Clay, was snatched up by the Northern Whig prints, and we were counselled to "read that," and be wise—"C. M. Clay is good authority with you," &c. But while this was going on, here, in the North, the letter had also reached the slaveholders, and they demanded, through their public prints, to know of the great "embodiment," whether such were his sentiments, yea or nay? Clay responded in a letter to the "Lexington Observer and Reporter," dated September 2, 1844, declaring with an effort to be very pleasant that "Mr. C. M. Clay's letter was written without my knowledge, without any consultation with me, and without *any authority* from me. I never saw it till I read it in the public prints. That gentleman is an independent citizen, having a perfect right to entertain and avow his own opinions. I am not responsible for them, as he is not for mine. So far as he ventures to interpret my feelings, he has entirely *misconceived them*. I believe him to be equally mistaken as to those in the circle of my *personal friends* and neighbors generally."

"In my speech addressed to the Senate of the United States, and in resolutions which I offered to that body, in my address to Mr. Mendenhall, about two years ago, and on various *other* public occasions, I have fully, freely, and *explicitly*, avowed my sentiments and opinions, on the subject of the institution of Slavery and Abolition. I *adhere* to them without *any reservation*. I have neither *entertained* nor expressed, publicly or *privately*, *any others*. And my friends and neighbors generally, so far as I have interchanged sentiments with them, coincide *entirely* with me."

So then here we have it, fresh from his lips, that he still holds to the blasphemous and villanous sentiments he uttered in the United States Senate in 1839, "without *any* reservation!"—nor that he has ever "entertained," even "privately," "*any*" other opinions. And yet a "Statesman of unimpeachable integrity?" I feel overwhelmed, in fear of such mockery!

What must be the feelings of C. M. Clay after reading this flat disownment of those sentiments of common honesty which he attributed to Henry Clay, I know not,—but certainly he might, nay, he *ought to feel*, that in flying from the course of principle marked out for himself, like a tangent from the centre—to vote "this once," for a slaveholder, though it should be for a distinguished relative, he has undertaken to do a very *small* and thankless business—a business entirely beneath such dignity and noble greatness as make up the character of C. M. Clay. And what will my friend Child say to these sentiments, again *reaffirmed?* Can it be possible that he will still cling to him? Such a thought to me, is too humiliating, I do not *want* to believe that he will.

Then, this *is the man*, to whom we are to look, to bridle the further extension of Slavery by Annexation? The Great High Priest of Slavery turn recreant to its interests and demands, and sacrifice henceforth upon the Altar of Freedom, instead of his chosen, and cherished and "sanctioned and sanctified" one, of despotism?

Where is the evidence to nourish such hope? If we turn to his first letter, we can find no Constitutional objection offered—none of a personal character urged, but simply, if certain difficulties were removed, and the question was then presented, "it would appear in *quite a different light*." Naming these difficulties, was only to demean himself with a little decency out of respect to his Northern allies—or rather to avoid any declarations which would prevent these Northerners from coming up to the work of his *own promotion*. *Clingman*, of North Carolina, had the true sentiment, when he declared during the late session of Congress, in a speech upon the "right of petition," that they of the South must be careful not to require too much of *their Northern* TROOPS!" So Clay's troops here were known to have some little scruples about admitting foreign territory for the extension of an "institution," which in turn plundered themselves, as well as its immediate victims; and therefore Clay thought it "*prudent*" to manifest for those scruples a little decent respect. He did not know his Northern neighbors as well as he *might*, or he would have found all this caution superfluous—so well are our *forces* trained to catch up and obey, the nod and beck of the Slave Power.

Well, this letter was *labled* "satisfactory" by the *wanted-to-be* satisfied North. All hands mustered, and every vote told; and then the South deemed it about time to have something a little more explicit from him. To this end, the editor of the "Tuscaloosa (Ala.) Monitor," conceiving that Mr. Clay had been misunderstood by some, relative to a portion of his Raleigh letter, wrote in his paper of 6th month, 19th, as follows:

"It has been *falsely* charged by his opponents, that Mr. Clay addressed himself for support, to the Abolitionists of the North," in that portion of his letter, in which he says he did not think Texas ought to be admitted into the Union, "in decided opposition to the wishes of a considerable and respectable portion of the Confederacy."

The editor then proceeded to argue, that Clay did not mean a "*respectable*" number of "Abolitionists," but "*States*," and then forwarded a copy of his paper to Clay, accompanied with a note, calling his attention to the matter. Clay at once responded in a *second* letter dated July 1, 1844, in which he says,—

"*You have justly conceived my meaning*, when I referred in my Texas letter, to a considerable and respectable portion of the *Confederacy*." "As to the idea of *my* courting the Abolitionists, *it is perfectly absurd*. No man in the United States has been half as much abused by them, as I have been."

"*Personally*, I can have no *objection* to the Annexation; but I certainly would be unwilling to see the existing Union dissolved, or seriously jeoparded, for the sake of acquiring Texas."

"It was a bubble, blown up by Mr. Tyler, in the most *exceptionable manner* for *sinister purposes*, and its bursting has injured *nobody but Mr. Van Buren*."

Still the ever vigilant Slave Power was not quite satisfied, and consequently Mr. John M. Jackson and Thomas Peters, of Alabama, wrote him another letter, stating that his views were still misconceived. To this he replied, in a *third* letter, dated 7th month, 27th, which was published in the "Tuscumbia North Alabamian," of "August 16th." In this letter he goes still farther—declaring that so "far from having any personal objection to the Annexation of Texas, I should BE GLAD *to see it*, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms. I do not think the subject of Slavery, ought to *affect the question*, one way or the other. Whether Texas be independent, or incorporated in the United States, I do not believe that it will *prolong* or *shorten* the duration of that institution." "It would be unwise to *refuse* a permanent acquisition, which will exist as long as the Globe remains, on account of a temporary institution."

Here, then, we have the whole of it, out at last—that he "would be glad to see it"—that Slavery ought not "to affect the question one way or the other"—that Annexation will not "prolong or shorten" the existence of Slavery—and that we ought not by any means to "refuse" such a bargain, owing *merely* to such a "*temporary* institution" that cannot last longer than a "*hundred and fifty, or two hundred years*."

What monstrous moral turpitude! Friends of the slave, how can you overlook such sentiments, and vote for their author?

But perhaps these will all reply, as does our friend Child, that Clay still alludes to the difficulties in the way of Annexation—difficulties which they apprehend cannot be removed, and that Clay is bound in honor *now*, not to overlook them. One thing is certain, that while these friends maintained after his first letter, that he was himself *personally* opposed to the measure; they will *now* have to admit that he is not only in favor of it, but "would be *glad* to see it" accomplished, and that all the reasons which weigh with them, at least the great leading one, of the extension of Slavery, does not weigh with him *at all*; but, on the contrary, we may fairly infer from his atrocious sentiments, that he "would be glad to see it," for the *very reason* which these friends *oppose* it. Before going into the argument to show how easy a slaveholder can get over all the difficulties in the way of Annexation, alluded to by Clay, and the almost certain probability of their speedy removal under *such* an Executive, if they can be removed at all, and that he will be the very man who will exhaust the utmost effort of his diplomatic powers to that end,—and that to vote for such an one, is to give direct aid and countenance to "*immediate Annexation*,"—I say before going into the argument to demonstrate, as I think it can be, these positions, I will give the reader some testimony from the South, from Southern Conventions, leading journals, and leading men, to show that the Southern Whigs are unanimous in favor of Annexation at the "proper time," and that they rely upon Henry Clay, *as the very man*, to consummate the deed, and at the earliest moment that it can be effected by any one, with any show of propriety and regard for decency—and they even rely upon it being done *sooner* under his administration, than under that of one, who might not have *any* regard for honor, public faith, or propriety.

Says the Richmond Whig, a leading Clay paper, and perhaps the one that gives the cue to the Southern journals generally:—"From every quarter we learn that the excitement which the friends of Annexation are endeavoring to create, will not come at their bidding."

"Let us not be misunderstood. The people of Virginia, as far as we have been able to learn, and we presume none others in the State possess better sources of information, are *in favor of Annexation*, at the proper time and under proper circumstances."

Hear the Baltimore American, decidedly a *leading* Whig paper:

"If those who really desire the annexation of Texas, would consider the subject fairly, they would probably find, that the chances in favor of a safe and secure Annexation, are *greater* with Mr. Clay in the Presidential chair than with any other man."

* * * * * * * * *

"But it is well known that Mr. Clay, when Secretary of State, was anxious to secure that portion of territory known originally as Texas. If he were at the head of Government, and a fair opportunity should offer of recognizing that region, *the presumption is strong, that he would avail himself of it*—and the more especially if it should be in accordance with the wishes of the country. If Texas cannot be had honorably and fairly, it should not be had at all; if it can be had honorably and fairly, Mr. Clay's administration will probably witness the consummation of the measure of Annexation."

The Whig Convention of Georgia, to nominate electors, passed the following:—"Resolved, That we are in favor of the annexation of Texas to the United States at the earliest practicable period, consistent with the honor, and good faith of the nation."

"In Mr. Clay's ability, experience, and patriotism, they (the people) will have the surest guaranty that Texas will be annexed in the most secure and honorable manner."—*Extract of a letter of James Lyons, a Whig elector of Virginia.*

"Immediate Annexation, is not considered so important a matter, that it should absorb everything else. A majority of the people are in favor of it, at a proper time, but they are willing to abide that time."—*Nashville Whig.*

A Whig writes in the "Charleston Courier," that he sees no reason for holding meetings in Charleston in favor of immediate Annexation,—"For Mr. Clay and Mr. Van Buren, are only opposed to the measure under present circumstances, and they not only admit the propriety of bringing Texas into the Confederacy when the objections are removed, but the great probability is, that in *a short time* these objections *will disappear*."

Leslie Combs, an influential Whig leader of Kentucky, and on the Clay electoral ticket, was strongly in favor of immediate Annexation, but, after the letter of his leader, was entirely satisfied with leaving the question to be settled by him.

The "Mobile Advertiser," the leading Whig paper of Alabama, engages to prove that Mr. Clay, and the Whig party generally, at the South, are *in favor* of Annexation.

The great Whig Convention at Murfreesboro', Tennessee, resolved unanimously that they were in favor of the Annexation of Texas; and that they had confidence in Mr. Clay's management of that question, agreeably to their views and interests.

The Clay Club at the seat of Government of Alabama, passed resolutions unanimously in favor of Annexation.

"The feeling is gaining ground, that enough has been said and done upon the Texas annexation subject, till Mr. Clay is elected." They expect then, that the subject will "*be brought before the American* people upon its merits, and will soon be disposed of, as it should be."—*A New Orleans Correspondent of the National Intelligencer.*

"We don't object so much to the THING ITSELF, as to the *man* and the *party* by which it is to be accomplished."
National Intelligencer.

"Indeed the ground taken upon it (Annexation) in this quarter, that those who support Mr. Clay are unfavorable to Southern institutions, and opposed to Southern interests—is as insulting, as it is false, and should arouse an honest indignation in the breast of every true Whig."
Hon. S. S. Prentiss, of Mississippi.

I add here a sentiment or two, from *even* Northern Whig prints, with Southern principles:

"Mr. Clay's letter on the subject of Annexation (the first one, remember) appears to give universal satisfaction. Many of the friends of Annexation say that Mr. Clay *goes far enough for them.*"—*New-York Commercial.*

"If the people of Texas choose to be a British colony *now*, rather than *wait two years for admission* to the United States, they are not worthy to form a portion of a free Commonwealth."—*New-York Courier and Enquirer.*

For the want of room, I am compelled here to close the testimony on this point for the present—intending to resume it in my next, as I have some of the strongest yet untouched.

Respectfully, &c.

ON THE RIGHTS OF GOVERNMENT.

It has become fashionable of late, among a certain class of Abolitionists, to decry the Federal Constitution on account of its pro-slavery character, and even to repudiate its authority so far as to talk about seecession from the Government, and to intimate in unequivocal terms, they owe no allegiance to it. In this our friends appear to have placed themselves in a false position; partly from an oversight, in not making the proper distinction between the rights of Government, and the wrongs which it may commit by an unwarrantable assumption of power.

If society is the natural state of man, and if its advantages cannot be enjoyed by him in the existing condition of the human family, without some form of government; it follows that this institution is a natural and necessary appendage of his being; ordained by God, when he fashioned the human mind, and fixed its various attributes. This question I will not argue at present, but will take it for granted that Government may have a rightful existence: and by this name I mean what I suppose other people mean by it, that is, power wielded by human beings, in regulating and controlling matters of general interest to the nation. If, then, Government has a rightful existence, there must be some things which it may rightfully do. Those who administer it, must have a certain sphere of discretion,—a right to direct and control some things according to their judgment of propriety. They must also have the power of carrying their decisions into effect; and of course to do whatever is necessary for that purpose. This right on the part of the Governors to direct and to do, implies a duty on the part of every individual, to acquiesce in the decision thus made, and to conform to whatever it may require at their hands. This is a moral duty; and its relation extends to all those things which of right belongs to the Government to do; and to all questions which that authority has a rightful power to decide. But while Government has its rights, which individuals may not justly disregard, the people in their individual capacity have rights also, which Government may not invade, without the commission of a wrong.

The sphere of discretion which properly belongs to each is fixed in the nature of things; and the rights resulting from it, are as immutable as the principles of right and wrong, on which they rest. Hence the rights of Government are as much the gift of the Creator, as those with which he has invested individuals; and are as much entitled to respect. If Government trenches upon the rights of individuals, the latter are under no moral obligation to comply with the unjust requisition; nay, it may be, and often is their duty, to bear a testimony against the wrong, by refusing their aid, in carrying it into effect. On the other hand, those who refuse to conform to the requisitions of that power to which they owe allegiance, or to which they are subject, so far as these are included within the sphere of its legitimate powers, are guilty of a breach of the moral law, and are more or less disturbers of the just order of society.

It is not necessary in this place to define the rights of Government with precision. It is sufficient for our present purpose to know, that it must of necessity have a legitimate sphere of action, within which it possesses full authority to do whatever is necessary to answer the ends for which it was instituted. This authority of Government reaches to all the inhabitants of the territory over which its jurisdiction extends; for, if it did not, we might rightfully have two or more independent powers, each exercising at the same time, full and entire jurisdiction over the same territory; a state of things productive of inextricable confusion, and involving a tissue of absurdities. Hence each one of the people constitutes part and parcel of the body politic, possessing all the rights, and owing all the duties, which naturally belong to that relation.

It may be said, in answer to this view of the subject, that Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; and consequently, that it cannot rightfully exercise over a person, any authority, to which he has not specifically consented. But this idea is inconsistent with that of territorial jurisdiction; and if it is correct, any company of people might associate together, declare their independence, and without any local separation from their fellows, form a government to suit their own fancy; so that we might rightfully have as many separate sovereignties, as we now have of religious and other associations, all jumbled together in the most perfect confusion. Besides, if the doctrine is true, the plea of non-consent ought to be admitted as a good one to exempt all manner of offenders from the treatment due to their crimes. It is manifest, therefore, that Government possesses a rightful authority over individuals, altogether independent of their consent; and the statesmen of '76, when they put forth the Declaration of Independence, were not guilty of any such absurdity as to contradict this position. They were controverting the then prevailing doctrine that the authority to govern belonged to certain persons as matters of hereditary right; and when they spoke of the consent of the governed people, they meant what we now mean by similar expressions, when we speak of conclusions being adopted by a society or body of people. The act spoken of, or referred to, is the act of those who have a right to speak on behalf of the collective mass; and this right is generally understood to belong to a majority of the members. We are told in the same declaration that the people have at all times a right to alter or abolish their Government, as to them shall seem meet; but surely none will suppose that our Fathers meant to assert, that each individual of the nation, had a right to alter or abolish its Government to suit his own fancy, whenever he might think proper to do so; yet this would not be one whit more absurd than to suppose that by "the consent of the governed," they meant the consent of every individual of the people governed.

But we hear it said that the existing national compact is "a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell." "That it enjoins obligations and duties incompatible with allegiance to God." "That it is in practice an insupportable despotism," with many other equally polite expressions, to indicate that the Government of the Union sanctions and supports Slavery. Admit this to be true, it does not justify the friends of impartial liberty in withdrawing from this compact their support and allegiance. The compact of Government relates to many other things besides Slavery; things in themselves right and just, proposing ends to be attained which are unexceptionable. With regard to these we have certainly duties to perform. The wrong done by the Government in supporting Slavery, is a sufficient reason why we should withhold our personal service in carrying out the evil design; but it is no reason why we should refuse our aid to those measures and operations to which we have no objections. A person has not a right to withdraw his support and allegiance from his Government, whenever he may judge that the controlling power does a wrong: for if this right of withdrawal exists as it appears to be assumed, "the powers that be," could exercise no rightful authority over any of the people who believed that any of their acts were in violation of the moral law. This in practice would be equivalent to an absolute denial of their rightful authority over anybody; so that this doctrine of the individual right of secession is only another form of that which teaches that all Government is wrong, and of course ought to be immediately abolished. This doctrine appears to have taken deep hold of the minds of some of our leading Abolitionists, so that they can scarcely think, or talk, of anything, without bringing it into view, in some of its Protean forms. It is a very harmless doctrine when presented fairly and simply to our consideration; for it is so directly opposed to the common sense, and common instincts, of our nature, that few persons of sane mind can be found, who would not reject it at once. But it is dressed up in such a variety of shapes, and made an ingredient in so many of the dishes that are served up for us at intellectual banquets, connected with our Anti-Slavery gatherings, that many will swallow it even whole, without being aware of what they have taken.

This doctrine of the right of secession, has no affinity with that which teaches, that when any Government enjoins upon its subject, acts which violates the duties which he owes to a higher power, it transcends its rightful authority; and that the subject is under no moral obligation to comply with that requisition. And as a necessary consequence of the practical operation of this principle, *no one can be rightfully compelled to perform any act which he believes of a criminal character.* The Government is under obligation to depend for the carrying out of its measures upon the active agency of those who do not think them criminal, but no insurmountable barrier is thrown in its way, for the people, without exception, are under a moral obligation to abstain from all forcible opposition, however clear and strong their perceptions may be of the injustice of such measures. Nor has it any necessary connection with the question of the propriety of voting or holding office under the Constitution as it now stands, for a person may refuse to vote or hold office without doing anything like withdrawing from the Government, or repudiating its authority. This question I will not discuss at present, though I probably will at a future time.

For reasons above stated, and others which might be adduced, I am decidedly opposed to the use of any expressions which imply that we desire the overthrow of the existing compact, the subversion of the present Government, the repudiation of its authority, or that we "have no relation to this Government except to wage an exterminating war against it." All such declarations, whether made by resolutions or societies, or in the public speeches of influential members, go to place the Abolitionists in a false position; and so far as their influence extends, they impress false views of duty and perverted notions of the nature and extent of human rights. They must, therefore, like all other errors and delusions in relation to this vital subject, exercise a pernicious influence upon the success of our cause.

WILLIAM JACKSON.

HARMONY GROVE, Sept. 7th, 1844.

LIBERTY PARTY.—TEXAS.

FRIEND GAY:—I am under the necessity of making a slight correction of my statement in last week's paper, in respect to the "Liberty Party." It was not my intention to convey the impression that *all* the leaders of that party were cognizant of the fact stated with regard to Thomas Morris. I should have used a more cautious phraseology, in order to leave no room for quibble. Some of the leaders, and those of the principal ones, were cognizant of the fact, that at the time of his nomination for the Vice Presidency, that gentleman held the opinion that *colored men ought to be debarred the use of the elective franchise!* Others became cognizant of it subsequently, and acted with the party notwithstanding. It was a subject of correspondence between Dr. Bailey, editor of the Philanthropist, and Gerrit Smith. Lewis Tappan was informed of it also; but my informant corrects me with regard to Mr. Birney, with whom he never conversed on the subject. It was a misunderstanding on my part, arising from a confusion of names, to place Mr. Birney in such a connection. Yet, I have the best reason to know that he was acquainted with other points of Mr. Morris's character, which, in the eyes of prudent, sagacious, and honest men, would have totally disqualified him as an Anti-Slavery candidate for the Presidency.

Once more, before they cast their votes for the "Liberty Party," I ask Abolitionists to pause and reflect upon the exposition here made. It is no fiction. I am authorized by my informant to say, that he will, in due time, under his own signature, submit such proofs with regard to it, as shall not fail to convince impartial and truth-loving minds.

☞ A "LIBERTY PARTY," WITH A CANDIDATE WHO DENIES TO COLORED MEN THE USE OF THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE!!

Whether Mr. Bailey and others became acquainted with this extraordinary fact, before, or after rendering their cohesion to the party, it matters not. They should have denounced such a candidate, as unfit to be trusted—as unworthy the votes of freemen. But they have not done it. On the contrary, they have gone into a second nomination, and persist in upholding before the Anti-Slavery men of this country, as worthy of all confidence, a *man who denies to his fellow-citizens, because they are "guilty of a skin not colored like his own," a right which he professes by his very position, to esteem as inalienable and most sacred!*

So much for the consistency and honesty of "Liberty Party." I would not consider this as a final argument against voting for Thomas Morris, if by such voting, and that alone, the calamity of Annexation could be adverted. But who pretends to say that it will answer any such purpose? On the contrary, it may guarantee the success of that nefarious scheme. It may turn the balance against the only party that has the power to say, ☞ *A new slave empire shall not be created by this Government!* It may give the reins of Government to a party which goes into office, (if at all,) *pledged beforehand* to do that vile deed of *creating a new slave empire!* Abolitionists of Pennsylvania, YOU ALONE may save the nation from this crime! In the name of humanity, *do it!* Turn not a deaf ear to the imploring petition of thousands of slave mothers, who plead for future millions!

The acceptance of Mr. Birney, of the nomination proffered him by the Democratic party of Michigan, to the Legislature of that State, is another page in the history of Liberty Party, over which its members will do well to pause. Their candidate for the Presidency has entered into a coalition with one of those great National parties, which they have never ceased to denounce as indissolubly wedded to Slavery, and utterly irreformable, and as therefore making a final plea for their own separate organization.

Men who love freedom! Will you cast your vote for a party whose leaders so grossly violate the first principles of their Anti-Slavery faith?

I am much mistaken in the good sense of the Abolitionists of this country, if thousands of them do not, under these circumstances, resolve to throw their influence into the only scale, in which the slave can feel it—against the Annexation of Texas—an issue of their own creation, and more pregnant of good or evil to the colored race, than any other act which lies within the power of any Government on earth.

That appears to me but a mere substitute for an argument which answers to all the reasons in favor of voting the Whig ticket, "Henry Clay is a Slaveholder." When Abolitionists appealed to Northern men for aid in their reform, and were answered by them—"We are not slaveholders—go to the South and talk to them—we have nothing to do with Slavery"—they replied, with great honesty, truth, and indignation, "You are worse than the Southern slaveholders, for, without the plea of self-interest, you are active co-partners in sustaining Slavery, and but for you, it could not exist a day." On this showing, it is at least no worse to vote for a slaveholder, than a northern non-slaveholder. And I take this to be sound reasoning. The *country*—the *nation* is the slaveholding power, and we its citizens, North and South, are *particeps criminis* in the act. Let us therefore cease our assumption of innocency with regard to the existence of this evil. Let us drop the *you*, and say, in conduct as well as in words, *we*.

On looking back over the history of legislation in this country, Great Britain, France, &c. we shall assuredly find that the adoption of this sophism would have prevented every act of Government which has given freedom to millions of our race. No fallacy can be more obvious in theory, or harmful in practice than that which refuses all co-operation in

phistry, awed by power, nor seduced by promises of reward into the abandonment of our defence of good. But on all occasions, by word, deed, and pen, we shall "persevere in vindicating the *right*, and resisting the *wrong*. We can abandon you, but we cannot abandon justice."

Would not such a position, *now*, entitle us to be heard in the councils of the Whig party? Would it be possible for that party to turn a deaf ear to the demands of humanity, reason, and justice, when urged with zeal and determination, by an hundred and fifty thousand freemen? And it is thus *only* that we can defeat the infamous project of adding a new Slave empire to the Union!

JAMES S. GIBBONS.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1844.

Take Notice.—There is a paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Our friends and correspondents will please be sure and direct to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

MR. LEAVITT AND THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Emancipator of the 9th instant, contains two articles, entitled, "A Sketch of the American Anti-Slavery Society,"—intended as a defence of the doings for which the old Executive Committee was removed from office, at the Annual Meeting of 1840. Mr. Leavitt has been driven from the prudent silence which he has endeavored to maintain on this subject, by the general attention which the recent statements of those transactions have attracted, and the unanimous reprobation which they have received from all men of honor and of business. He has conducted himself, generally, in the very difficult position in which he has placed himself, with singular address and dexterity from the beginning. Whether this last demonstration be equally well-advised, depends on the extremity of the straits to which he finds himself reduced, and to the extent to which he can rely upon the simplicity of his own public. His distress must have been very great, and his confidence in the capacity of his readers' swallow extreme, before he could have been willing to make such a defence as this. I can hardly conceive that the Third Party can be so stultified as not to feel their intelligence insulted by such an explanation. They can hardly fail to see through its sophistries, notwithstanding the multitude of words wherewith Mr. L. has sought to darken counsel, and the religious care which he has always taken that they should see nothing said on the other side, except in his own garbled version. To disentangle Mr. L.'s points from the wordy cloud in which he has seen fit to enclose them, (for no man can make a plainer statement than he, when he pleases,) is all the answer they will need.

Mr. Leavitt's main ground of defence of the Committee of which he was a member, is substantially the same that he alledged last year. He does not indeed repeat the same lucid statement, which did so much honor to his candor and his intrepidity at that time; so I will do it for him. I have had occasion to repeat it a good many times; but it is oneof those golden sentences which become only more luminous by being gazed upon.

☞ "IN SELLING THE EMANCIPATOR AND IN ASSIGNING THE OTHER PROPERTY OF THE SOCIETY, THE COMMITTEE ACTED NOT AS TRUSTEES, BUT AS OWNERS!!!!" ☜

His point is to show that the Committee were an independent body, not responsible to the Society that appointed them, and he makes it out thus. After a long and not particularly pertinent account of the history of the Society, he comes to its organic constitution. The Society, it seems, in those times, at its Annual Meetings, chose a smaller number of their own body, called a Board of Managers, which Board elected the Executive Committee; *therefore*, implies Mr. Leavitt, the Committee were not accountable for their doings to the Society;—whatever they did, it was none of the Society's business! By a parity of reasoning, because the people of the United States choose a college of Electors "whose sole business is" to choose a President and Vice President, *therefore*, the President and Vice President, when elected, are not responsible to the people for what they do! I do entreat the good people of these United States to ponder well this doctrine, before they proceed, next month, to place Mr. Birney in the White House, and Mr. Leavitt in the Department of State. If they administer the Government on this principle, their dynasty will be the very golden age of financiers, Swartwouters, and *absquatulators*.

The Committee had, to be sure, as Mr. Leavitt states, full *power* in the intervals of the meetings to do what they pleased with the property and funds which the Society placed in their hands. His fallacy lies in confounding the *power* with the *right* of doing what they pleased with them. Mr. Biddle and his Directors had the *power* to do what they did with the funds of the United States Bank, but if Mr. Leavitt will take the pains to ask the opinion of any of the shareholders, he will find that the two things are not necessarily identical. Mr. Leavitt speaks of the large sums contributed by members of the Committee in the first years of the Society. Admitting all that he says to be true, (though I think his statements would be found to be much exaggerated,) what does it prove? If they had given every cent that was ever received, did it not become the property of the Society the moment it came into the treasury? I mean, of course, on the ordinary principles which govern bodies coporate, not on those laid down by Mr. Leavitt; for according to him, the funds they contributed only became the property of *the Committee*, and like whatever else was placed in their hands, became THEIR OWN! Mr. Leavitt also speaks of the energy of the Committee, and of the unanimity with which they were supported by the Society for several years. This is all true. The Abolitionists had implicit faith in those men, and it took a long time to convince them that they had become unworthy of their confidence. At last, however, it was but too plain that the Religious Public of the Committee having presented the distinct issue to them of choosing between their sectarianism and their Anti-Slavery, they had taken their part, and were devoting the funds placed in their hands not for the abolition of Slavery, but for the destruction of the Anti-Slavery movement. When the Abolitionists were at length convinced of this, they first stopped the supplies, and then came up to the Annual Meeting to dismiss their unjust stewards. Mr. L. makes this extraordinary assembly of the members of the Society, on this most extraordinary occasion, a cause of grave complaint! They did precisely what Mr. L. in a previous paragraph says it was their right to do,—the members "who thought proper, or could make it convenient to attend the Annual Meeting"—to choose officers and do their other business. For doing this, Mr. L. calls them "CONSPIRATORS!" And says that they "SURREPTITIOUSLY obtained possession" of the Society! The "extraordinary means," of which Mr. L. speaks, were merely the public appeals to the members to attend, and an arrangement by which they could go at a reduced expense. Mr. Leavitt forgets that the friends of the Committee in Massachusetts did precisely the same thing, and that Mr. John Jay, as President of the Young Men's Society, to which the Emancipator had been *conveyed*, issued an address, virtually calling upon all New-York to come to their rescue. It will be remembered that the Committee had so managed, in anticipation of their dismissal from office, (to justify which acts, these articles of Mr. L.'s were written,) that the organ of the Society, and every stiver of its property remained in their own hands, and in those of their tools,—that nothing was left it but its name and its honor,—and now Mr. Leavitt magnanimously tells his readers that "THE CAPTORS HAVE NEVER BEEN DISTURBED IN WHAT THEY GOT FOR BOOTY!!!" Truly, it reminds one of the adventure in one of the Spanish *picaresque* novels, where poor Guzman meets in Seville some rogues, who had just before stripped him to his shirt on the highway, who forthwith seize him and accuse him before the Corregidor of having robbed *them*. But the comic circumstance in this whole business is, that if the Society were *conspirators and pirates*, in coming to their own Annual Meeting, and doing their own business, Mr. LEAVITT HIMSELF *was as guilty as any of them of all that they did!* For he remained with the Society as its Secretary until it adjourned, and took part in all its proceedings! He did not secede with the minority, but remained at his post to the end, and expressed no disapprobation at anything that was done. An informal proposition had been made by the young men who had possession of the Emancipator, of restoring it to the Society on condition that Mr. LEAVITT should be its editor, and the officers were not chosen till late in the meeting. Had this proposition been accepted, and had Mr. L. been chosen an officer of the Society, with the salary he had before enjoyed, there is no reason to doubt that he would have been with us unto this day. Disappointed in both these points, *the very next week, he went over to the hostile society and became one of its officers!*

Mr. Leavitt having thus satisfactorily proved that the Committee were not accountable to the Society, and had a right to do what they would with THEIR OWN, (the treasury of the Society,) *because* they were elected by an intermediate body, and not by the Society at large, proceeds to some auxiliary proofs that the Society was not itself, but something else. "A conclusive proof is, that the great body of the members, from that hour, have withdrawn support from the new Committee." I apprehend the proof is all the other way. The American Society finding itself stripped of its organ, and of all its other property, went to work anew. It immediately established this paper, at a great expense, which has been issued weekly, without interruption, ever since. It has employed many agents, and has carried on an extensive agitation in all parts of the country. The discarded Committee, on the other hand, in its new shape of Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,—consisting *of the very same men* who had composed the old American Committee, with two exceptions, who adhered to the Society,—have not employed a single agent, or carried on any operations, and even were unable to support a *monthly* paper for one year, but virtually expired of inanition before that time! Their organ has just, I believe, completed its *first volume* of *monthly numbers*, in *four years* from its inception! These men who had received from the Abolitionists previous to the secession more than TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS—since that time have not received enough to sustain a monthly publication,—probably not involving an expense of a thousand dollars. While the American Society has had funds enough furnished for its purposes, the Foreign Society died almost as soon as it was born, because it could not get them. The fact is, that about all the money-givers and the buyers, were on the side of the Society, and as soon as they lost their confidence in the old Committee, their funds ceased to come in. Mr. Leavitt attributes the falling off in the receipts in the last half of eighteen hundred and thirty-nine and forty, to the *hard times*,—it was solely owing to want of confidence in the Executive Committee. The same reason accounts for the publications and other stock remaining on the hands of the Committee. All the buying Anti-Slavery public were members or friends of the American Society, and of course refused to buy their own property of their servants who had carried it off with them. This the Committee did not know at the time, nor did we, but the result has proved it to be so. Mr. Leavitt asserts that the receipts of the American Society have fallen off since the "first paroxysm of party triumph" brought funds into the treasury,—whereas they have been regularly increasing every year. He seems to regard it as a matter of reproach that we have reduced our expenses to the lowest point. We look upon it as a matter of just pride that we have our committee-work done, including editors' salary, office expenses, &c. for about *nine hundred* dollars—that used to cost the old Committee something like *ten thousand*, particularly as the work is better done. But we have no needy adventurers to quarter upon the cause.

Perhaps the most impudent of all the propositions contained in these articles,—and that is a bold word,—is Mr. Leavitt's reproaching us with not having paid the debts which the old Committee contracted, and to secure which they carried off all our property. It may be, or it may not be, that the Committee have not realized the amount of their liabilities from the assets in their hands. If they had done their duty, and restored the property to its rightful owners, there is no doubt that every farthing of the debts would have been paid—*although the Society was not bound in honor to pay a farthing of them*. For this reason, at the Annual Meeting of 1839, a proposition was made to limit the sum to be raised by the Committee to $32,000. This would have passed by a great majority, had it not been for the reclamations of the Committee, whose nice sense of honor could not brook such an imputation of want of confidence in them. It was accordingly not pressed to a vote, but it was only on the distinct understanding that the Committee understood and would obey the pleasure of the Society. Scarcely had it adjourned, however, when they proposed a plan for raising $100,000, and actually raised $47,000 in six months! Whatever they expended over $32,000, was, in equity, at their own risk, and the Society would not have been liable to any just complaint from *them*, had they refused to pay these debts which they had contracted in defiance of their known will. But these debts would all have been paid, for the honor of the Society, had not the Committee assumed them, and seized upon all its property to indemnify themselves. The Society has had to raise a larger sum than those debts amounted to for the establishment and support of an organ to supply the place of the one of which it had been deprived. I must do the Committee the justice to say that this is the first time that any suggestion of this kind had been made. I do not think that there is another man of them who would have the face to make it. But enough for the present. Mr. Leavitt promises another statement of how he got the Emancipator, which will probably afford me an opportunity of saying anything which I am compelled by want of room to leave unsaid at this time, particularly as to the pretence of poverty under which the Committee made away with the Emancipator, and the other property of the Society.—Q.

JAMES G. BIRNEY.

In to-day's paper will be found another letter from this Liberty Party candidate, for the Presidency, and Democratic candidate for the Michigan Legislature. Mr. Birney has shown great want of candor in this matter, as in his first letter he carefully avoided answering the questions,—whether he had reason to believe that he had been nominated by the Democrats,—and whether he knew or not before he left home that such would be the case—on both which points he was bound to be explicit, as involving his character as a politician, and that of the party of which he is the head. Now, when it can be no longer concealed, he acknowledges the nomination, but asserts, that for local reasons, he is not held up as the candidate of a party. As a sort of incidental proof that such *may* be his position in his own county, he asserts that the Whigs also the last year contemplated the propriety of giving him a nomination. He seems to forget that as the Whigs *did not* nominate him, the very natural conclusion to which menn will come, is, that it was because he *was not* a Whig, and the opposite proposition will very naturally follow—that he was nominated by the Democrats, because he *is* a Democrat, and ready to uphold the measures and strengthen the position of that party. On the other question,—whether he knew before he left home that he was to be nominated—he remains perfectly silent, though he has written another letter for the public, since that question was put to him directly by the Tribune.

In his last letter, addressed to the Liberty Party, Mr. Birney showed evident signs of trepidation. He says, "I have received letters from some of you since I came here, evincing disquietnde, at the effect of my position." He begs them not to be alarmed, and endeavors to reassure them, and asks for their confidence, and offers his own. Even his own friends doubt him. He says, however, "*I am not under the slightest party pledge.*" This may be very true, and the Democrats of his county may be very willing to take him without any positive pledge. But the evidence is very weighty, showing that he is at least in a very equivocal position, if it does not settle the question of his new political relations. The North Star of Oct. 3d, published at Saginaw, contains the *official* proceedings of the Democratic County Convention, in which is the ticket nominated by that party, headed "For Representative, James G. Birney," and the other nominees are well-known and uncompromising Democrats. The Detroit Daily Advertiser gives an extract from a letter from "a gentleman of the first respectability" in Saginaw, in which it is asserted that Mr. Birney solicited the nomination, and when the meeting of delegates was convened, the gentleman to whom he had stated his desire for such nomination, stated to the meeting that Mr. Birney had told him, he was a Democrat in principle, and *would, if elected, support Democratic men and measures.* Upon this representation by one of the "most influential and candid Democrats in the country, Mr. Birney received the nomination of the party." If Mr. Birney has not acknowledged, neither has he denied this to be true, excepting the assertion in regard to a pledge. It is worthy also of remark that these charges come from Whig papers published in his own neighborhood and State. If the Whigs mean to vote for him as an independent candidate, it seems probable that the Whig press in Michigan would be likely to know it. If Mr. Birney is faithful to the Liberty party, is he acting in good faith towards the Democrats? It has an ugly look either way.

I do not wish to do Mr. Birney injustice in this matter, but were I a Liberty party man, and considered him an unobjectionable candidate on every other ground, I could not give him my vote, until he had explained more satisfactorily than he has done, the doubts of his plain dealing and political honesty, that attach to this nomination.—G.

P. S. Since the above was in the printers hands, the Detroit Advertiser has been received, in which is a Circular of the Whig State Central Committee of Michigan, and to which is subjoined a "Sworn Statement of Wm. S. Griggs, Esq. a gentleman of intelligence and perfectly unimpeachable moral character," and for whose "unsullied honor and veracity," the Committee vouch. If this statement, made under oath, and endorsed by a State Committee, may be relied on, the evidence is complete and indubitable, that Mr. Birney knew he was to be nominated, and was consulted beforehand,—that he was nominated as a partisan Democrat—is pledged to carry out "Democratic principles," and to "REFRAIN FROM AGITATING THE QUESTION OF ABOLITION IN THE HOUSE!" And this, be it understood, is no random rumor, but comes authenticated *by the solemnity of an oath* from the man who derived his information from the person who *made the bargain* with Mr. Birney, and *can prove it by the hand-writing of Mr. Birney*—"BIRNEY THE JUST!" There is no room for the document in this paper, but it shall be published next week.

THE CONVENTION OF COLORED PEOPLE AT SCHENECTADY.

On the first page is the Report of the protesting Delegates from this city to this Convention. It tells its own story, and shows plainly that an act of gross injustice was done by the representatives of Liberty Party in that Convention. It is nothing more nor less than saying to the colored people of this State, "We will place you in a hostile position to the body of the people, who compose the two great parties, and commit you in favor of the third party, and you shall succomb to this arrangement whether you consider it right or not, or you shall have no voice in our counsels by your representatives!" The right of protest has been heretofore unquestioned in our Anti-Slavery meetings. At the last Annual Meeting of the American Society, and at the last N. E. Convention, several persons protested against the action of those meetings, and their right to do so, and record their protests upon the minutes of the meetings was not even questioned, so far as to take the vote. The opposite conduct is characteristic only of pro-slavery demagogues, and surprises us the more when displayed by colored men met together for the avowed purpose of freeing themselves from disabilities created by this very spirit in their white oppressors. The experience of tyranny should have at least taught the colored people better to understand and prize the spirit of freedom. The thanks of that portion of them who do not choose to be thus unceremoniously handed over to the Liberty party, are due to Messrs. Smith, Vidal, and Powell, for the straightforward and dignified course which they pursued.

Nothing, it seems to me, can be clearer, or more forcible than the argument of the Protest. The four propositions set the matter in so plain a light that the wonder is that the unscrupulous spirit of party even should dare to gainsay them. No surer course could be taken to defeat the purpose of obtaining the extension of suffrage that to make the question one of partisan politics. If this right is ever to be obtained by the colored people of this State, it should not be accepted even as the spoils of party triumph, or as a bribe for party support; but should be received only as it should be demanded, as a right pertaining to man, and not a privilege to be granted, or taken away by any party. It should be placed on the broad basis of human rights, and settled by an appeal to self-evident truths; and he who becomes a partisan in such a question is faithless to the principles of liberty. It should be demanded not of one party but of all parties,—not of a portion, but of the whole people. It is but to weaken the cause to take any other position than this. Particularly inexpedient is it to take a position hostile to the two parties before either of them have been thoroughly tested on the question; and preposterous to assume one by the side of that which cannot, in the nature of things, have it in its power to assert the right demanded for a long time to come, if it ever shall; and which even now, so far from being faithful on this very point, has as its nominee to the second office in the gift of the people, a man who has distinctly declared that the colored people should not be entrusted with the right of suffrage.

Appended to the Report, in a note, is a Protest of Messrs. Wright and Ray, which was probably meant to be a protest against the protest. This the Convention also refused to record, as the inconsistency in recording the one and rejecting the other would have been too palpable, and the one being rejected the other was not needed. If it was intended, however, to escape the charge of partiality, the effort was a signal failure. With the minutes are published letters from the Revd. Messrs. Wright and Ray, both of which use strong and unequivocal language in favor of the Liberty party, and in condemnation of the other two. They neither of them, it is true, urge the Convention to commit itself in favor of the Liberty party, but Mr. Ray hopes that it will "do nothing that can even from inference be construed against it;"—and adds, "Should the question come up, and were I present, my own line of duty would be plain, and what you may infer from the tone and spirit of this hasty letter." Mr. Wright, after condemning the other two parties in as strong language as that used by Mr. Ray, says: "My confidence is in the principles upon which the Liberty party is based. I believe they are just. But were it my happiness to be a member of the Convention, I would not be anxious for its formal identification with this party. I should not advocate it unless an issue between this and one of the other parties were forced upon me, or some action was proposed to the disparagement of the Liberty party. I would then feel called upon to stand by liberty principles." Under this assumed fairness there is an evident intention of instructing the Convention, which seems indeed to have been entirely under this clerical influence. For while the Protest, which distinctly defined the necessity of keeping entirely aloof from *all* parties, was refused a place, these two letters, which as clearly condemned two parties, and lauded a third, were recorded. Such is the impartiality and consistency of Mr. Garnett and his friends. And even in the very act of denying to the minority this simple and plain right of Protest against an evident assumption of power, they had the effrontery to give as one of their reasons for their rejection of the Protest, that, "They do not crave the enjoyment of the right of suffrage from the hands of any set of men who would deny us the Republican right of *thinking as we please.*" (!!!)

It is to be hoped that this lesson will not be lost upon our colored friends, and that they will watch very closely these designing leaders, who, under the specious name of Liberty, would deliver them from one bondage by binding them to another, more debasing in its effects, and the more difficult, therefore, to escape.—G.

AN APOLOGY is due to James Fulton for not publishing the article he requested. I do not receive the (Philadelphia) Herald, in exchange, and the number which M'Kim forwarded, containing the conclusion, did not reach me till too late for insertion this week. Dr. Stebbins' article is deferred for the same reason. Friend Flint's letter has been in type several weeks, but has been crowded out till now.

ERRATUM.—The article in last week's paper, entitled, "Attack on Mr. Birney," should have been credited to the Herkimer *Freeman*, and not the "*Journal.*"

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

TWELVE DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

The steamer Acadia, Capt. Harrison, arrived at Boston on Sunday.

The treaty entered into between England and France, for giving up offenders that take refuge in either country, has been carried out in the person of Jacques Bessett, charged with fraudulent bankruptcy, who has been taken into custody in London, and sent to Paris.

It is said the British Ministry intend to attack the Irish Repeal movement again.

Rumors exist that a treaty has been entered into between Brazil and England. This intelligence may or may not be correct.

Mr. Everett, the American Minister, is said to have solicited his recall.

The Queen of England, returning from Scotland, was expected to arrive in London on the 3d.

Tartans are becoming fashionable, in consequence of the Queen's visit to Scotland, and the patterns being patronized by her Majesty.

The Queen of Spain is dying.

The King of France would leave Treport for England on the 5th instant.

The Great Britain steam-ship is on the eve of being relieved from her confinement in the Bristol dock.

Repudiation denounced at the British Court.—It is very commonly rumored in the city, that it is the intention of Government to exclude from the Court, and from the Ministerial parties, all the foreign Ministers or Chargés d'Affairs, whose Governments have not faithfully fulfilled their engagements with their creditors in this country. Such a proceeding would place the United States representative in a very embarrassing and unenviable position.

IRELAND.

The repeal rent on the 23d September, was declared to be £600 12s. 6d.

The Repeal Association met on the 30th September. The meeting was addressed by Messrs. M. O'Connell and others, and the rent was announced to be £349 18s.

A special meeting of the Dublin Town Council was held on the 25th September, to consider a proposition of Dr. Maunsel to address her Majesty, praying her to hold her Court, and summon her Parliament once in three years in Dublin.

FRANCE.

A treaty has been concluded between France and Morocco.

TAHITI.

The Paris Moniteur, of Wednesday, the 25th ultimo, conveyed the following intelligence as received by the Government from Tahiti, dated 24th April:—"After having vainly endeavored to bring back to their obedience the rebels who made the attack at Taravau, Governor Bruat went out to meet them at Mahahana, where they had made themselves intrenchments, defended by 3,000 men and three pieces of cannon. On the 17th, Governor Bruat landed with 441 men of all arms. The redoubts were taken with the bayonet; the enemy having 102 men killed, their colors taken from them, and their cannon spiked. The next day we destroyed their works, and carried away their arms and ammunition. On our side we have to lament the loss of two officers, M. Naussuty, enseigne de vaisseau, and M. Seignette of the Artillery. We had, besides, 52 men wounded."

SWEDEN.

Popular disturbances have been occasioned by the rejection of the measure of reform recently discussed in the Diet; and there were riots on the 28th and 29th of August. The method of their suppression was curious. The police hired a number of assistants, miners, day-laborers, and others, all of them tall and powerful men, who mingled with the crowd, and who not only inflicted summary punishment for every attempt to create disturbance, but also arrested the most conspicuous among the rioters. Among the prisoners, fifty-six in number, were two opera dancers.

SPAIN.

A letter from Bayonne of the 23d ultimo, in the Morning Post, announces that a movement on a grand scale had been intended by the Carlists of Navarre; money and munitions of war, along with a large number of proclamations having been for some time past in readiness.

PORTUGAL.

The Portuguese Cortes opened on the 30th ultimo. The minister counts on a majority of 22 in the Chamber of Deputies, and it is expected he will be in a minority in the Chamber of Peers.

CHINA.

The Overland Mail.—A treaty has been concluded between the United States and the Celestial Empire, based upon the same principle as dictated that between England and China, in which America will enjoy all the advantages which Great Britain secured. This can hardly fail to be gratifying to America.

General Items.

SLAVE CASE.

Important Decision—discharge of a slave from service on board an United States Vessel.—Robert T. Lucas, a colored person, about forty years of age, was brought before Chief Justice Shaw on Friday last by a writ of habeas corpus, under the following facts:—In 1841, by written consent of the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Upshur, Lucas was received and entered as a landsman on board the United States frigate United States, in Norfolk, Va. At the time he was held to service as a slave, by Edward Fitzgerald, Esq. purser on board the frigate and was entered by his consent and also by the voluntary act of Lucas himself. It was proved that he was entered on the muster roll, and performed service as others did in that class, and was exclusively under the control of the commander of the frigate as a component part of the crew, and was not under the control of Mr. Fitzgerald, or in any manner subject to him, except the claim of Mr. Fitzgerald for his wages. The frigate sailed on a cruise to the Pacific, and was thence ordered to the port of Boston, by the commanding officer of the squadron, where she arrived on the 3d of October. The writ of habeas corpus was served upon Mr. Fitzgerald on board the frigate, without the knowledge or authority of Lucas. The case presented two points which have not been decided by the Supreme Court of this State, first, as to the claim of the commander of the frigate to the services of the party, as a part of the crew of the vessel, and second, whether his having been brought within this jurisdiction, without the consent of the master, who was about to return to his domicil in Virginia, the court here could interfere to discharge him from the claim of service which was valid in Virginia. To test this question as connected with the United States' service, Captain Stribling, the commander of the frigate United States, presented his claim under the shipment, and Mr. Fitzgerald, in his answer, set forth all the facts in the case, as to the relation of the party to himself. In giving his opinion, the Chief Justice said that these gentlemen had acted honorably in the transaction, and with entire frankness disclosed all the facts in the case; Mr. Fitzgerald had also fully assented to the suggestion of his counsel, before he undertook the case, that whatever the decision of the court might be, Lucas should be left free to act his own wishes, either to return to Virginia, or to remain, if Captain Stribling had no claim to retain him on board his ship. Sewall and Merritt appeared for the discharge, and Hallett for the respondent.

It was argued that the entry on board the vessel in Norfolk was valid by the lex loci, the laws of Virginia, and that the going out of the limits of that State, and an involuntary entering into this jurisdiction, did not invalidate that contract, and it must be held as binding here as in Virginia: and secondly, that if the agreement to enter on board the ship as one of the crew, was not originally valid, the case was to be regarded as a case of involuntary and necessary landing in and passing through Massachusetts on the return of the master to his domicil, and therefore this court could not interfere, under the Constitution of the United States, unless the point, which had not yet been decided, was to be ruled so as to confine the rights of the master exclusively to the case of a fugitive from service. In all the cases decided in this State, the court had only gone to the extent of decreeing a discharge where the party was voluntarily brought into this State by the act of the person claiming his service in another State, and in the leading case on this point in the 18th of Pickering, in the matter of the slave Avis, the court had expressly excluded from that decision the case of a slave involuntarily brought here, or landed from a vessel necessarily entering our ports, or driven in by stress of weather.

Chief Justice Shaw first made inquiry of the party apart, whether the process was instituted at his request, and ascertained that it was not, but that as it had gone so far he now desired it should proceed. This was deemed a sufficient authority for the parties who took out the habeas corpus to act for him. Lucas also desired to know what would be the effect of his discharge here if he returned to Virginia, but the Chief Justice said he could not advise him on that point, in case he was not released by the master.

In giving his opinion, the Chief Justice regarded the first point, as to the claim of Capt. Stribling, as highly important, and not without great difficulties in coming to a decision. He did not agree with the counsel for the discharge, that the United States could not contract for the services of a slave, and held that Lucas was lawfully entered and employed as a landsman on board the frigate in Norfolk, but this right could only extend to the territorial limits of Slavery, and was at an end whenever the service to be performed took the slave out of these limits. Hence, though the service was valid in Virginia, and would have continued had the vessel returned to a port in that State, it terminated on entering a State where Slavery did not exist. He also held that it was not an enlistment valid in law, because the slave had no power to contract for himself, nor had the master any power to contract for him to perform any service beyond the territorial limits of a slave State, and therefore it differed from the contract of a master for the services of his apprentice, nor was it competent for the United States to ship slaves in the naval service. It was also held that if a slave was employed on board a coasting vessel, and the vessel touched at a port in this State, the party would be discharged from service. On this point it was ruled that Lucas was not subject to the control of the commander of the frigate.

On the second point it was held that this was not a case of the necessary transit of a slave through this State; that by shipping him on board a vessel going out of Virginia, the master took the risk of her entering or being ordered into a free port, and, therefore, it could not be said that this was an involuntary coming into this State; but though beyond the control and against the consent of the master, it was a consequence of his voluntary act in placing the party in such a service. Whether if a vessel, conveying slaves from one slave State to another, should be cast away on the coast of Massachusetts, the slaves would thereby be free, no opinion was given; but the consent of the master that the slave should go as a passenger, or otherwise, in a vessel liable to land him in Massachusetts, under any circumstances, would be held as a voluntary bringing him into the jurisdiction, and he would be free. Lucas was accordingly discharged from custody, and being of full age, was left to return to Virginia or remain, as he might elect.

This decision greatly enlarges all the previous decisions in similar cases, and may be regarded as limiting the claim of the master strictly to the case of a fugitive. The writ in this case was issued by the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, in the absence of all the Judges of the Supreme Court, and a question left open by the statute arose as to the custody of the party by the Sheriff, the writ being returnable at Boston. The Sheriff applied to Chief Justice Wells as to the custody, who decided that he had no power to pass any order upon it. The officer accordingly kept the party in his personal custody, (having no authority to commit him, or to receive bail for his appearance,) until the Chief Justice returned to the city. The counsel for the discharge contended that they had a right of access to the party, but the Chief Justice instructed the officer that it was his duty to keep him apart.

The whole proceeding was conducted in as quiet a manner as the hearing of any ordinary case before our courts, and the objects of the respondents and their counsel was solely to have the law of the case fairly settled by the proper tribunals.—*Post.*

Married,

In Gardiner, Me. October 16, MARTIN GAY, M. D. of Boston, to Miss ELEANOR ALLEN, daughter of Frederic Allen, Esq. of Gardiner.

In Haverhill, Mass. October 17, Mr. ISAAC PITMAN, of Boston, to Miss HARRIET MINOT, daughter of the Hon. Stephen Minot, of Haverhill.

In Castine, Me. Rev. AMOS A. PHELPS, of Boston, to Miss LUCY T. LITTLE.

Died,

In Buffalo, October 14, Rev. CHARLES FITCH, formerly of Boston.

In Thomaston, Me. Mrs. CILLEY, widow of the late Jonathan Cilley.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For the Standard—from Oct. 6th, to Oct. 29th, 1844.

Wm. H. Benson, Mendon, Mass.		$2.00
David Wallingford, jr. Milton, N. H.		2.00
B. Jane Leighton,	" "	2.00
Maria L. Southwick, Blackstone, Mass.		2.00
Minores S. Brainard, Exeter, N. Y.		1.00
James Sherman, Milton,	"	2.00
John Young, Jr.	" "	4.00
Elias Durfee, Marion,	"	2.50
Allen Wardner, Windsor, Vt.		2.00
Julia Chickering, Amherst, N. H.		2.00
C. Chadbourn, Waterville, Me.		2.00
Isaac Post, Rochester, N. Y.		2.00
Ann Wood, Aurora,	"	3.00
John Alsop, Lavanna,	"	2.00
S. Howland, Sherwood's Corner, N. Y.		2.00
Alexander Young, Milton,	"	2.00
Valentine Treadwell, Cookeburg,	"	1.00
John P. Plank,	" "	2.00
L. G. Taylor, Fort Miller,	"	1.00
Garden H. Smith, Macedon,	"	1.00
Andrew J. Fearing, Hingham, Mass.		2.00
Tappan Bailey, West Newbury,	"	1.33
Josiah Tryon, Lewiston,		3.00
George Foster, Andover,	"	3.00
Richard Hayes, South Woodstock, Vt.		2.00
Jeremiah Browning, Hudson, N. Y.		2.00
L. Durfee, Palmyra,	"	2.50
		—— 55.33
Donations.		
Central New-York A. S. Society,		99.25
By Dr. Hudson,—		
Strong West, South Wilbraham, Mass.		2.00
Sarah Morgan, Brimfield,	"	3.00
Wm. Tarbell,	" "	1.00
Samuel Tarbell,	" "	1.00
Wm. Brown,	" "	.50
Festus Foster,	" "	2.00
Elijah Tarbell,	" "	.50
John E. Coleman, Southampton,	"	1 00
E. Hannon,	" "	1.00
Mrs. Joy,	" "	.50
By W. L. Garrison,—		
Mrs. Robert L. Bird, Boston,		1.00
A friend in Picton, N. S.		2.00
		—— 114.75
Total amount received		$170.08

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

NOTICES.

WEYMOUTH ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

It has been found impossible to make preparation for this Fair quite so early as was at first proposed, and notice of the time will be given hereafter. The friends of the cause are entreated to unite with fresh zeal, liberality, and industry, that the occasion may not fail to be what it now promises to be—one of great importance to the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, and of uncommon interest to its advocates. A few very beautiful articles from abroad have been already received, and donations of materials for making more; so that a large attendance on the weekly sewing meeting is more than ever desirable, as the time of the Fair approaches.

MARY WESTON,
SARAH H. COWING, } Com.

TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.

Dear friends and fellow laborers.—With hopeful hearts, we have commenced our preparations for our next annual fair, resolved that it shall be greatly superior to that of the last year. For the accomplishment of this purpose, we are dependent upon you. Will you not give us ample proof that we have not relied upon you in vain? You cannot need that we should offer you incentives to increased diligence and zeal in our common cause. The image of the suffering slave is vividly before your mental vision; and were you in any danger of forgetting the sad living picture, it would be frequently revived by some new odious manifestation of the slave power, or by the presence of the fugitive, crossing, in the haste of terror, your brighter path.

Nor need we present to you arguments in favor of this method of advancing our cause. You are aware that our fairs have been a source of great pecuniary profit, as the reports of the treasurer of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society show. The principal part of the profit derived from them have passed into the treasury of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, of which you are members. In asking your assistance, then, we are but asking you to aid our common cause, through the agencies which you have constituted. You have nobly responded to our calls, in other years. Have you not commenced our second decade with renewed ardor and increased self-sacrifice? Will you not evince it by immediately beginning, with us, preparations for the fair of 1844? Labor, each according to your ability or inclination, to let each do something. All marketable commodities, useful or ornamental, will be gratefully received. If our contributors will send, with their manufactures, a statement of the cost of the materials of each, the committee estimating the labor expended on them, will be careful to prevent any article from being sold at a price below its value. A very large part of the articles sold, yield a *fair profit*. If any of our friends in the country, will come and superintend the sale of their articles, they will be most welcome, and their aid truly valuable.

We are sorry to say that our poultry stall was not as well furnished as usual last year. Will not abolitionists who are preparing produce for their own tables or the market, remember, and give us a practical proof that they remember the physically and spiritually starved slave? Give to him, as God hath given to you, freely, abundantly.

We advise all who intend to work in this department (and what abolitionist in Eastern Pennsylvania doe not) so begin at once to do something, and enlist th sympathies and efforts of as many others as possible

We are sure, dear friends, that none of us will regre having done too much, but we may regret having done too little for the emancipation of two and a half millions of slaves.

On behalf of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society.

Anna M. Hopper,	*Maria M. Davis,*
Mary Grew,	*Emma Parker,*
Sarah McKim,	*Matilda Casey,*
Phebe Earle,	*Taressa Hallowell,*
Huldah Justice,	*Elizabeth J. Neall,*
Susan Dorsey,	*Rebecca Stackhouse,*
Gertrude K. Burleigh,	*Sarah Pugh,*
Harriet Snyder,	*Mary Shaw,*
Margaret Griscom,	*Sarah Dorsey*
Sarah M. Douglass,	*Margaret Jones,*
Harriet D. Purvis,	*Margaretta Forten,*
Hetty Burr,	*Esther Reckless,*
Mary T. Stickney,	*Jannette Jackson,*
Martha T. Carman,	*Elizabeth Carman,*
Mary Earle,	*Lydia Gillingham,*
Sidney Ann Lewis,	*Hannah Lee Stickney,*
Sarah Lewis,	*Susan Grew,*
Susan Shaw.	

PHILADELPHIA, April 23d, 1844.

NEW-YORK WHOLESALE PRICES CURRENT.

CORRECTED WEEKLY FOR THE STANDARD.

ASHES.		**IRON.**	
Pot, first sort 1844.	4.18½ a	Pig, Eng. & Sc. ton	31.00 a 32.00
Pearl	4.25 a 4.31½	do. American	30.00 a 31.00
CANDLES.		Bar do. rolled	80.00 a .
Mould, tallow lb.	9 a 12	do. Russia P,S,I,	95.00 a 100.00
Sperm	30 a 32	do. do. N. Sable	75.00 a .
Stearic do.	30 a 35	do. Swedes	77.50 a .
COAL.		do. Eng. com.	62.50 a 66.00
Liverpool, chaldron,	9.00 a 10.00	do. do. refined	80.00 a .
Newcastle	7.50 a 8.00	Sheet E. & Am. lb.

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

TO CASSIUS M. CLAY.

Thou hast an old heroic name,
And an old Roman hate
Of all that saps with fear or shame
The bulwarks of the State.

A hatred of the mean thou hast,
A stern hate of the vile,
Which, long as tyranny doth last,
No art can reconcile.

And, more, thou hast a love as deep
As e'er with man was born,
For those who tremblingly do reap
Their heritage of scorn.

A true, bold heart, a soul so free
Free words must issue forth,
Though round the bondsmen bend the knee,
And fettered is the North.

Such men as thou renew our faith,
Crime shall not last for aye;
Their very birth a promise hath
Of a serener day.

Their hands are strong, but not for strife,
Save that which God ordains;
Their thoughts are of a nobler life,
Where peaceful justice reigns.

Though often tempted, sorely tried,
By earthly doubts and strong,
They bear right onward 'gainst the tide
And foaming front of wrong.

Now prisoned by the world's applause,
Now by its hate made free,
They faint not, but in Freedom's cause
Fulfill their destiny.

PHILADELPHIA, September, 1844.

From the Countryman.

"THE LONG BRIDGE."—THE ESCAPE.

A thrilling account of the tragical incident on which the following poem is founded, was written by Seth M. Gates, M. C. from New-York, who was an eye-witness, and published in the N. Y. Evangelist.

A young female slave escaped, one evening, from the slave prison, which stands midway between the Capitol and the President's House, and ran for the "Long Bridge," which passes from the lower part of the city across the Potomac, to the extensive forests and woodlands of the celebrated Arlington Place.

Now, rest for the wretched! the long day is past,
And night on yon prison descendeth at last.
Now lock up and bolt! Ha! Jailor, look there!
Who flies like a wild bird escaped from the snare?
A woman, a slave—up, out in pursuit,
While linger some gleams of day!
Let thy call ring out!—now a rabble rout
Is at thy heels—speed away!

A bold race for freedom—on, fugitive, on!
Heaven help but the Right, and thy freedom is won.
How eager she drinks the free air of the plains;
Every limb, every nerve, every fibre she strains:
From Columbia's glorious Capitol,
Columbia's daughter flees
To the sanctuary God has given—
The sheltering forest-trees.

Now she treads the Long Bridge—joy lighteth her eye;
Beyond her the dense wood and darkening sky,—
Wild hopes thrill her heart as she neareth the shore:
Oh, despair! there are *men* fast advancing before!
Shame, shame on their manhood! they hear, they heed
The cry, her flight to stay,
And like demon forms, with their outstretched arms,
They wait to seize their prey.

She pauses, she turns; Ah, will she flee back?
Like wolves her pursuers howl loud on her track;
She lifteth to Heaven one look of despair—
Her anguish breaks forth in one hurried prayer,—
Hark! her Jailor's yell! like a bloodhound's bay,
On the low night-wind it sweeps!
Now death or the chain! to the stream she turns,
And in she leaps! Oh, God, she leaps!

The dark and the cold, yet merciful wave,
Receives to its bosom the form of the slave:
She rises—earth's scenes on her dim vision gleam,
Yet she struggleth not with the strong rushing stream:
And low are the death-cries her woman's heart gives,
As she floats adown the river,
Faint, and more faint, grows the drowning voice,
And her cries have ceased forever!

Now back, Jailor, back to thy dungeon again,
To swing the red lash and rivet the chain!
The form thou would'st fetter—a valueless clod;
The soul thou would'st barter—returned to its God:
The universe holdeth no realm of night
More drear than her slavery—
More merciless fiends than here stayed her flight—
Joy! the hunted slave is free!

That bond-woman's corse—let Potomac's proud wave
Go bear it along by our Washington's grave,
And heave it high up on that hallowed strand,
To tell of the freedom he won for our land.
A weak woman's corse, by freemen chased down;
Hurrah for our Country, hurrah!
To freedom she leaped through drowning and death—
Hurrah for our Country, hurrah!

SARAH J. CLARKE.

NEW BRIGHTON, Pa. July, 1844.

From "Summer Rambles in the West."

TRIFORMIS.

So pure her forehead's dazzling white,
So swift and clear those radiant eyes,
Within the treasure of whose light
Lay undeveloped destinies.
Of thought repressed, such hidden store
Lay in the flitting of each smile,
I could but wonder and adore,
Far off in awe, I gazed the while.

I gazed at her, as at the moon,
Hanging in lustrous twilight skies,
Whose virgin cresent sinking soon,
Peeps through the leaves before it dies.
Untouched Diana, flitting, dim,
While sings the wood its evening hymn.

Again we met, O joyful meeting!
Her radiance now was all for me;
Like kindly airs, her kindly greeting
So full, so musical, so free.
Within romantic forest aisles,
Within romantic paths we walked,
I bathed me in her sister smiles,
I breathed her beauty as she talked.

So full-orbed Cynthia walks the skies,
Filling the earth with melodies;
Even so, she condescends to kiss
Drowsy Endymions, coarse and dull;
Or fills our waking souls with bliss,
Making long nights too beautiful.

Oh fair, but fickle Lady moon,
Why must your full form ever wane;
Oh, Love! Oh, Friendship! why so soon
Must your sweet light recede again!
I wake me in the dead of night—
And start—for through the misty gloom
Red Hecate sinister—a boding sight
Looks in, but never fills my room.

Oh! music of my boyhood's hour,
Oh! shining light on manhood's way,
No more dost thou fair influence shower,
To move my soul by night and day.
Oh stranger! that when in hall and street,
Thy hand I touch, thy grace I meet,
Such miles of polar ice, should part
The faintest touch of mind or heart.
But all thy love has waned, and so
I gladly let thy beauty go.

Miscellany.

From the Democratic Review.

BLIND JACQUES.

BY MRS. E. F. ELLET.

An admirer of Eugene Sue, in a letter addressed to him in the *Journal des Debats*, expresses himself profoundly affected by the picture of the Maitre d'Ecole, in the Mysteries of Paris. But, he adds, another image shapes itself before me—a living personage whom I have seen—an image which contrasts with yours in such a manner as to complete your idea. He is blind like the Maitre d'Ecole; of the common class, and in the possession of all his faculties, in the midst of his misfortune, yet he finds support where the other finds an abyss; the same loss elevates him which sinks the other to nothing. Every step of the Maitre d'Ecole plunges him deeper into bondage and despair; for my hero, every moment that passes is a link fallen from his chain, a shadow chased from his soul. In a word, the one still seeks good; the other evil; the one loves; the other hates.

The sketch, simple, and drawn from actual life, has in our eyes a touching and beautiful moral. Perhaps something of its force may be preserved in a translation. E. F. E.

About a year since, in the month of December, two men, one young, the other on the verge of old age, were walking along a stony road in one of the villages, in the neighborhood of Paris. Coming towards them, and climbing the rough ascent, was a man harnessed to a sort of dray, laden with a cask; he held his head down, and beside him walked a little girl of eight years old, holding by the end of the dray. Suddenly one wheel rolled upon an enormous stone, and the dray was nearly overturned on the side next the little girl.

"He is drunk!" cried the young man, rushing toward them; but when he looked into the man's face, he turned back quickly towards his old companion, and said, "He is blind!"

The other motioned him to be silent, came up, and without a word, laid his hand on that of the drayman, while the little girl smiled roguishly. The blind man raised his head eagerly, his countenance lighted up with an expression of joy, and grasping the hand that touched his, he exclaimed in a tone of emotion—

"Monsieur Desgranges!"

"How!" cried the young man, surprised, "you recognize him by a touch of his hand?"

"I have no need of that; whenever he passes near me, I say to myself, 'That is his step!'"

And pressing the hand to his lips, "It is you again," he cried, "dear M. Desgranges, who have saved me from mischance; it is always you!"

"Why," asked the young man, "do you expose yourself to such accidents by drawing this cask?"

"One must do one's business, Monsieur," replied the drayman, cheerfully.

"Your business?"

"Certainly," answered M. Desgranges, "Jacques is our water-carrier; but I must scold him for going out without his wife to guide him."

"My wife was absent, and I brought the little girl, you see. I have done well since I have met you, dear M. Desgranges, and you have assisted me."

"*Allons*, Jacques, finish serving your customers, and afterwards you may come to see me. I am going home."

"Thanks, Monsieur Desgranges! Adieu, Monsieur adieu——."

And he went on, drawing his water-cask, while the little girl turned her smiling, rosy face to look at the gentlemen.

"Blind, and a water-carrier!" repeated the young man as they went on.

"Ah, you wonder at our Jacques, my young friend! Yes, it is remarkable; but what would you think if you knew his history?"

"Will you tell it me?"

"Willingly. It contains no uncommon events, and no dramatic incidents; but I believe you will be interested, for it is the story of a soul—a noble one—struggling against calamity. You may observe how, step by step, the victim climbs out of the abyss, and renews his life; how a crushed heart gradually recovers its vigor, and the helpless man finds he has yet a place in the world."

The friends had arrived at the house of M. Desgranges, when he commenced the story.

One morning, three years ago, I was walking across the extensive dry plain that separates our village from that of Noisemont, and is partly covered with blasted rocks. I heard a violent explosion, I looked, and, at the distance of four or five hundred paces saw a whitish smoke that seemed to rise from a cavity in the ground. Fragments of the rock at the same time were thrown into the air; a moment after, I heard dreadful cries, and a man sprung out of the cavity, and ran across the field like one insane, flinging his arms wildly about, uttering cries of pain, and stumbling at almost every step. His face, as well as I could perceive at a distance, amidst rapid movements, seemed covered by a large red mask. I hastened towards him, while from the direction of Noisemont came running men and women, with screams of terror. I was the first to reach the unhappy man, and saw with horror that his whole head was one frightful wound. His skull was laid bare, the skin was torn from his forehead and part of his face, and the blood streamed in torrents from his torn garments. As I took hold of his arm, a woman ran towards him, followed by twenty peasants, exclaiming, "Jacques, Jacques! is it thou? I know thee not, Jacques!" The unfortunate man answered not, but struggled to escape from our hands, and as he did so, scattered the blood in every direction. "Ah! ah!" cried the woman, in a voice of heart-rending anguish, "it is he!" She had recognized him by a large silver pin that fastened his shirt.

It was indeed her husband, the father of three children, a poor miner, who, in blasting a rock, had received the whole explosion in his face, and was blinded, mutilated, perhaps mortally wounded. He was carried home. I was obliged the same day to leave for a month's absence; but I sent him our doctor, a man who united the scientific knowledge of the city practitioner to the kindness of the country physician. On my return, when I asked him how was the blind man, he answered, "He is lost. His wounds are healed, his head is uninjured, only his sight is gone; but he will not live. Despair will kill him. 'I shall never see again!' is all he says continually. I fear that an internal inflammation has already begun."

I hastened to the invalid; I shall never forget the sight that presented itself. He was seated on a wooden stool beside the chimney, in which there was no fire, a white handkerchief bound over his eyes; on the ground was lying, asleep, an infant three months old; a little girl, four years of age, was playing in the ashes; another, a little older, was shivering in the opposite corner, and at the other side of the room his wife was seated on the bed, pale, emaciated, her arms hanging down. There was more of misery in this scene than met the eye. The conviction struck on my heart, that perhaps for hours not a word had been uttered in this abode of despair. The wife sat listless, and seemed no longer to care for anything in the world. They were not merely unhappy; they had lost all hope. At the sound of my footsteps as I entered, both rose, but without speaking.

"You are the blind man of the quarry?" I asked.

"Yes! Monsieur."

"I have come to see you."

"Thanks, Monsieur."

"You have suffered a great misfortune."

"Yes! Monsieur."

His voice was cold, and betrayed no emotion. He answered mechanically. He expected nothing from any one in the world. I said something of public sympathy, and of aid to be extended.

"Aid!" exclaimed the woman, in a kind of desperation, "they owe us aid, indeed! We *ought* to be relieved, for we have done nothing to deserve such a stroke as this! My children *must not* be suffered to die of hunger!"

She asked no charity; she claimed succor as a right. This imperious appeal touched me more forcibly than any lamentations she could have employed; and I emptied into my hand some pieces of silver from my purse; but her husband answered, in a tone of sullen despair, "let them die, the children, since I am never to see again!" There is a singular power in the tones of the human voice. I dropped my money again into my purse; I was ashamed to offer this chance aid; and I felt that it was necessary to give them more than a mere alms; that money could not restore contentment to that hearth. I returned home with my resolution fixed.

"But what could you do for them?" asked his young friend.

"What could I do?" replied M. Degranges:—"what could I do?"—fifteen days after that interview, Jacques was saved; in a year he was in the way of earning his own support; and now he sings at his work."

"But how was this done?"

"How? By a means very natural; by —— but stay, I think I hear him coming; yes, it is he. I will leave him to tell you himself his simple history. It will touch you more from his lips; it will embarrass me less, and his earnest and cordial manner will complete the effect of the narration."

A noise was heard without of some one drawing off his sabots at the door, and presently a light knock was heard.

"Come in, Jacques"

He entered with his wife.

"I have brought Julienne, this time, dear M. Desgranges; the poor woman is so happy to see you again for a little while."

"It is very well, Jacques: sit down."

He advanced, feeling before him with his stick, so that he should not run against any of the chairs, and having found one, seated himself. He was young and of a slight figure, but strongly made. His dark hair curled over an open and expansive forehead. His features were prepossessing, and animated by a cheerful expression, particularly when he showed his white teeth in smiling. His wife remained standing just behind him.

"Jacques," said M. Desgranges, "here is one of my good friends who wished much to see you."

"He is an excellent person since he is your friend."

"You must talk with him while I go to see my geraniums; but you must not be sad; remember, I have forbidden that."

"No, no! my dear friend."

This expression of affection struck the young man; and, after his friend had gone out, he approached the blind visitor.

"You love M. Desgranges?"

"Do I love him?" repeated the blind man, impetuously. "Monsieur! he saved me from hell! I was lost; my children had no bread; I was dying of despair; he saved me!"

"He gave you money?"

"Money! what is that! Everybody gives money! Yes! he nourished and clothed us; he made a collection of five hundred francs. But all that is nothing. It is he who healed my heart!"

"And how?"

"By his good words, Monsieur! Yes! he, a person so excellent and honorable, he came every day to my poor hovel; he sat down on my poor bench and talked with me for an hour, two hours, that he might make me happy."

"What did he say to you?"

"I cannot tell; I am but a stupid fellow; and you must ask him to repeat what he said; but it was all about things I had never heard of before. He spoke to me of the good God better than a priest. It was he who taught me how to sleep, again!"

"How was that?"

"I had not had a night's sleep for two months, for whenever I began to doze, I would awake, saying to myself, 'Jacques, thou art blind!' and then my head would whirl and whirl like a mad man's; and that was killing me. One morning he came in—that dear friend—and said to me, 'Jacques, do you believe in God? Well, to-night, when you strive in vain to sleep, and the idea of your misfortune takes hold on your mind, repeat a prayer aloud, then two, or three, and you shall see that you will go to sleep.'"

"Yes!" said his wife, with her calm voice; "the good God then gave him sleep."

"That is not all, Monsieur! I was going to kill myself! I said 'Jacques, thou art useless to thy family; thou art a burden; a sick woman in the house!' But *he* said, 'Is it not you who still support your family? Had you not been blind, would any one have given them five hundred francs?'"

"That is true, M. Desgranges."

"If you had not been blind, would any one have taken care of your children?"

"True, Monsieur."

"If you had not been blind, would you have been loved so much as you are?"

"True, Monsieur, it is true."

"Observe, Jacques, every family has to bear some misfortune. Disaster is like the rain; something of it must fall on every head. If you were not blind, your wife would, perhaps, be an invalid, or you would lose one of your children; in place of that, it is you, my poor friend, who have all the suffering; they are spared."

"True, true!" and I begin to feel less depressed; I felt happy to suffer for them. Afterwards he said, "My dear Jacques, misfortune is man's greatest enemy or his best friend. There are persons whom it renders wicked; there are others whom it makes better. I wish it would cause you to love everybody; to be so kind, so grateful, so affectionate, that when people are talking of the good, they may say, 'As good as the poor blind man of Noisemont. That will serve as a portion to your daughter.' Thus he gave me courage to be happy."

"Yes, but when he was not with you?"

"Ah! when he was not there, I had, indeed, very gloomy moments; I thought of my eyes, and of the blessing of sight. Ah! Jacques continued mournfully, 'if God should permit me ever to see again, I would never lose a moment of the precious daylight!'"

"Jacques, Jacques!" said his wife.

"You are right, Julienne! He has forbidden me to be sorrowful. He always observed it, Monsieur. Would you believe, whenever my head has been bad during the night, and he comes in the morning, at the first glance he always says, 'Jacques you have been thinking of that;' and then he scolds me, that dear friend that he is."

"Yes, added the blind man, with a smile, 'and I like to hear him, for he cannot speak harshly even if he would.'"

"And how came you to think of making yourself a water-carrier?"

"It was he who thought of it. How should I have any ideas? I was cured of my great distress, but I began to be weary of myself. Only thirty-two years old, and to sit all day upon a bench. Then he undertook to instruct me, and told me a great many Bible histories; the history of Joseph, of David, and many others; which he made me repeat after him. But my head was hard, for it had not been used to learn; and I grew every day more weary of my arms and legs."

"And he tormented us all like a *loup garou*, said his wife, laughing."

"All true, answered the husband, also laughing. I became wicked. Then he came to me and said, 'Jacques, I must put you to work.' I showed him my poor burned hands. 'I know it; I have bought you a stock in trade.' Me! Monsieur Desgranges?' 'Yes, Jacques, a stock where you need deposit nothing, and yet you will always find merchandise.' 'It has cost you much, Monsieur!' 'Nothing at all, mon garcon.' 'Where is it?' 'In the river.' 'The river! Will you have me turn fisherman?' 'No, you shall carry water.' 'Carry water! But my eyes?' 'What do you want with them?' said he. 'Have the brewers' horses any? When one has them, then they do service; when one has them not, one must do without them. *Allons*, you shall be a water-carrier.' 'But a cask?' 'I will provide one for you.' 'But a dray?' 'I have ordered one from the wheel-wright.' 'But customers?' 'I will give you my custom in the first place, eighteen francs a month; (that dear friend! he paid as dear for water as wine!) and besides, I will have no more said about it; I have dismissed my water-carrier, and you would not have my wife and me die of thirst? That dear Madame Desgranges, indeed! Go, mon garcon, in three days, to work! and you, Madame Jacques, come along! and he took Julienne—'

"Yes, Monsieur," interrupted the woman, "he took me, and put on the leather straps, and harnessed me; we were quite bewildered, Jacques and I. But who can hold back against M. Desgranges? At the end of three days, there we were. Jacques harnessed, and drawing the cart with his cask of water, and I following and directing him how to go! We were ashamed at first, as we went through the village, as if we had done something wrong; it seemed that everybody was going to laugh at us; but there was M. Desgranges in the street, crying, "Allons, Jacques, courage!" we went on; and in the evening he put into our hands a small piece of silver, saying—"

"Saying," cried the blind man, with emotion, "Jacques, here are twenty sous which you have *earned* to-day." Earned, Monsieur, think of that! Earned! And for the last fifteen months I had been eating the bread of charity! It is good to receive from good persons, truly; but the bread earned by one's own hands, let it be ever so coarse, nourishes the best! I was no longer a useless person, a burden! but a workman! Jacques earns his living!"

"How," asked the young man; "does this occupation bring you enough to live upon?"

"Not entirely, Monsieur; I have yet another business."

"Another business?"

"Oh, yes; the river is sometimes frozen over, and the water-carriers, as M. Desgranges says, have but poor encouragement; he has given me a business for winter as well as summer."

"A business for winter?"

At this moment, M. Desgranges came in; Jacques heard him, and asked, "Is it not true, Monsieur, that I have another business besides that of carrying water?"

"Certainly."

"And what?"

"He is a wood-sawyer."

"A wood-sawyer! How is that possible? How can you measure the length of the sticks, or manage the saw? or cut the wood without hurting yourself?"

"Hurting myself, Monsieur?" repeated the blind man, with a look of honest pride; "you shall hear. In the first place, I used to saw wood, and I understood the business; the rest I have learned. Suppose a quantity of wood under the shed, at the left; my saw and knee-covering before me; and the wood to be sawn in three pieces. I take a string; I cut it one-third the length of the wood; there is a measure. I am careful and expert; and so I saw a good part of the wood used in the village."

"Besides," added M. Desgranges, "he is a capital messenger."

"A messenger?" repeated the young man, surprised.

"Yes, Monsieur: when I have a message to carry to Melun, I take my little girl on my shoulders, and away we go!' See sees for me; I walk for her; and those who meet me say, "There is a man who has his eyes very high!" to which I answer, it is to see the further. And in the evening I come home with twenty sous more in my pocket."

"Are you not afraid of stumbling against the stones?"

"I lift my feet high enough to avoid them; and now that I am used to it, I come often from Noisemon thither, alone."

"Alone! how do you find your way?"

"I take the wind when I start from home, and that serves me for the sun."

"But the puddles?"

"I know them."

"The walls?"

"I feel them. When I come near anything solid, Monsieur, the air is less fresh against my face. Not that I always escape some pretty hard knock; for example, when a handcart is left standing in the street, and I come upon it without warning! But bah! what matters that? Then I have been so unlucky as to lose myself—as the day before yesterday ——"

"You have not told me of that, Jacques," said M. Desgranges.

"I was very much puzzled, my dear friend. While I was here the wind changed; I was not aware of it, and kept on my course, till, at the end of a quarter of an hour, I found I had lost myself somewhere on the plain of Noisemont. You know the plain; not a house—not a passer by; I dared not stir. I sat down on the ground, and listened; after a few moments I heard at a short distance the sound of running water. I said to myself, it is the river! I grouped my way, guided by the sound; I came to the water; it was the river. By dipping in my hand, I thought I could find which way the water ran. Then I could follow it and come home."

"Bravo, Jacques!"

"Ah, the water was so low, and the current so weak, I could not feel it against my hand. I put in the end of my stick, but it did not move. I scratched my head bewildered; and then cried, I am a fool!—where is my handkerchief? I tied it on the end of my stick, dropped it in the water, and found that it moved slowly, very slowly, to the right! Noisemont was on the right! I arrived there safely, just as Julienne was beginning to be anxious about me."

"Indeed!" exclaimed the young man, "this is admira—" But M. Desgranges checked him hastily, and leading him to the other end of the room, whispered, "Silence! do not corrupt by a thought of pride the simplicity of this honest man. Observe how calm and tranquil is his face, after the story which has affected you. Do not spoil him by admiration."

"It is most touching!" replied he in a low voice.

"Truly; and yet that does not constitute his superiority. A thousand blind men might have been ingenious in finding resources; there are no limits to the devices of the human mind; but this is a work of the heart. It is the heart that, in this case, opened itself so quickly to elevating consolation. It was the heart which reconciled him to his unfortunate lot—which accepted a new life. Be not led into error; it is not I who have saved him; it is his affection for me. His warm gratitude has filled his being; he is restored, because he has loved!"

At this moment Jacques rose softly, hearing their voices, and with a kind of delicate discretion, said to his wife,

"Let us go, without making any noise."

"You are going, Jacques?"

"I interrupt you, my dear M. Desgranges."

"No, stay longer," said his benefactor, and approached, cordially extending his hand. The blind man seized and pressed it to his breast.

"My dear, kind friend!" he cried, "you permit me to stay longer with you! you know how happy it makes me to be with you. Whenever I am melancholy, I say to myself, Jacques, the good God, because thou hast suffered much will perhaps place thee in the same paradise with Monsieur Desgranges, and the thought gives me joy again."

The young man laughed in spite of himself, at this expression of regard.

"You laugh, Monsieur? And is it not he who has made Jacques a man again? I have never seen him, but his image is always before me Oh, if God should ever give me my eyes again, I would gaze upon him always, like the sun, till he said to me, 'Jacques, go away, thou weariest me!' but he would not say so, he is too good."

"Jacques! Jacques!" said M. Desgranges, gravely, interrupting him. But the blind man went on:

"I rejoice when I know he is in the village; I dare not come hither as often as I wish, but I pass before the house, which always stands there; and when he is gone on a journey, I make Julienne lead me to the plain of Noisemont, and bid her turn me in the direction in which he has gone, that I may breathe the same air with him."

M. Desgranges placed his hand on his mouth, but Jacques escaped from the restraint.

"You are right, Monsieur Desgranges; my mouth is a fool, it is only my heart that can speak. Come, wife," continued he gaily, and wiping away the tears that rolled from his sightless eyeballs, we must go and get supper for the young ones. Adieu, my dear, kind friend! Adieu, Monsieur ——."

And he went out feeling before him with his stick. As he put his hand upon the latch, M. Desgranges called him back.

"I have a piece of news yet that will please you, Jacques," said he. "I had intended to leave the village this year, but I have just agreed upon a lease of five years with my landlady."

"There, Julienne," said the blind man, turning to his wife; 'did I not tell thee, he intended to go away?"

"How did you know it? I forbade every one to say anything to you about it."

"Yes—but"—he placed his hand upon his heart, "this informed me. I heard a few words, a month ago, which caused me some trouble in my mind; and then Monsieur, last Sunday your landlady called on me, and spoke to me in a manner much more kind and friendly than usual. Afterwards I said to my wife, "now I know that Monsieur Desgranges is certainly going to leave us, that woman wanted to *console me*."

Jacques departed a few moments after.

SICK-ROOMS AND SLEEPING-ROOMS.

If we turn to a sick-room, we are apt to surmise, that the Doctor in attendance never once takes the state of the lungs under his serious consideration, except in cases of apparent consumption. Although he has learned from anatomy, that pure air is most essential to them, still he allows his patient to be in a tomb, as it were, walled round with dense curtains, where the wholesome breeze can find no admittance, and where the foul vapors issue from the feverish mouth, and return to it, and from thence to the lungs, which are barely able to perform their duty. The windows are constantly shut, and the door most carefully closed, by which mischievous custom the lungs have no chance of receiving a fresh supply of air from without, and at last the patient sinks in death for want of it. If those in typhus fever were conveyed to an open shed, screened on the one side from the blowing wind, with a sufficiency of clothes upon them, very little physic would be required; for the fresh air would soon subdue the virulence of the disease in nine cases out of ten. When a person finds he cannot sleep at night, if he would open his window, and take a few turns upon the room, there can be no doubt, but that sweet sleep, *placidissime somne Deorum*, would return with him, arm-in-arm to bed. Wonderful is the degree of heat which is generated by the human body, when prostrate on a soft bed. Those parts of the sheets which do not come in contact with it, will, of course, retain their wonted coldness; and then, if the person becomes restless in his sleep, and rolls over upon them, he runs a fair risk of contracting rheumatic pains scarcely ever to be removed. Should a man ever have the terrible misfortune to pass the night in a damp bed, he would be much worse off than if he had been condemned to lie on a pismire's nest. These little tormenters would merely blister him, perhaps even with salutary effect: but the humid bed would cause him damage, often beyond the power of art or nature to repair. I trust we may safely conclude, that when the soft and downy preparations for the repose of the night have been completed, we do wrong, very wrong indeed, to exclude the night air from our apartments. That we can absolutely do without it, is certain; but that we should do better with it, is equally certain. Still, civilized man will never change his usual habits, but will go snoring on from night to night, awake this hour, and dozing that; whilst his lungs, had they the power of speech, would cry out, and say:—"Oh! we cannot stand this nasty atmosphere; we are obliged to work all night, and still you seem to have no pity for us. What, with the unwholesome vapors, arising from your own overloaded stomach, and what, with the stagnant air in the room, we shall be overpowered at last, do what we can to keep our action up; and then, for want of having your window an inch or two open, (which would put everything to rights in our apartment,) when you least expect it, you will be called away to your long account by a fatal fit of apoplexy."—*Waterton's Essays on Natural History.*

From the Correspondence of the London Times.

ALGERIA.

It is shocking to see so many brave men throw away their lives on such a sterile and miserable conquest as Algeria. You are reminded also, that the razzias continue, that the destruction of all culture and dreary desolation widen and widen every day. As to "monotony of misery and sufferings" furnished by the hospital lists and registries, it beggars all descriptions. I can tell you on the best, or official authority, that often at Oran there has been 2,000 sick at once in the hospitals. Now there is more than 1,100. Every new acquisition on the coast is turned into an hospital. The whole of Algeria, unless the war stops, with the exception of the few agricultural colonies established by the French, will be a vast and horrible desert. This is the inevitable result of the present system of things.

At Algiers, the head of Embarack was "served up" at a *soirée* of Marshal Bugeaud, something in the style of the serving up on a charger of the head of John the Baptist, mentioned in the New Testament. When all eyes had been sufficiently regaled with the sight of the head of the brave chief of the desert—the unconquerable enemy of the French (conquered only by accident)—the Marshal, yielding only to his instincts as a soldier, gave the head a funeral with the ceremony awarded to the rank of a lieutenant, and the head of Embarack was at last buried, either at Medeah or Miliana, with all due military honors.

I am sorry that the abolition of Slavery and the Slave-Trade is not a portion of the civilization which is to be introduced into Algeria; for this inhuman traffic, and this degraded state of human beings, are precisely in the same state as at the epoch of the French conquest, with the exception of the prohibition of public slaves. I find, by inquiry, that a great number of slaves are in the possession of the Spahis, French indigenous cavalry. About five days ago a negress was sold to one of these Spahis, and the girl ran away from her new master, and returned to her old one. The poor girl was then sold to a Bedouin: from him also she ran away, and returned to her first master. The man who originally possessed her, fearing to lose the purchase money, determined to cure the poor wretch of running away by tying her up by the heels, head downwards, and beating her stark naked, until she became senseless. This is a specimen of Moorish domestic slavery under the tricolored flag of civilization in Algeria.

COOKE, AT LIVERPOOL.

Cooke had been playing on a previous occasion, when great excitement prevailed on account of the agitation of the Slave-Trade abolition question in Parliament. Cooke fancied himself insulted because his benefit had not been equal to his expectation; and passing in his usual state by one of the coffee-houses, he beheld several of the merchants assembled in the room and vicinity. Shaking his fist at them, he exclaimed: "I thank my God I carry away none of your d—d money; every brick in your accursed town is stained with African blood." When he appeared afterwards on the stage, the hubbub was indescribable. He attempted to speak, but was saluted by cries of, "Off, off!" and a shower of hisses. Silence was at length restored, and Cooke addressed the audience in these words: "Ladies and Gentlemen: If you will allow me to go through my part, I will never disgrace myself by appearing before you again." He then retreated to the side scenes, and said to a party there, from whom this anecdote is derived, with a satirical expression of countenance: "It's the blood—the blood." The managers advertised him for the next night, with the same card—Richard the Third and Sir Archy Mac Sarcasm. The signal of his presence was one universal hiss. Cooke advanced to the stage, placing his hand on his breast, with affected humility, waited until the tumult subsided, and then entreated the audience to hear him. "Had I not been unfortunately interrupted, ladies and gentlemen," said he, in his blandest accents, "my address to you would have been thus: Ladies and Gentlemen, if you will allow me to go through my part, I will not disgrace myself by appearing before you again *in the same condition*." The ruse succeeded. "Bravo, Cooke!" resounded, and he played Richard with more than his usual energy.—*Memoirs of Munden, by his Son.*

From the Register.

CHRISTENING SLAVES.

Mr. EDITOR:—The Popish notion of christening babies, bells, &c. sometimes carries itself curiously. A sailor of my acquaintance, who was formerly engaged in the Slave-Trade, under the patronage of the Brazilian Government, in giving me some account of his adventures in that traffic which he now detests, related the following: Whenever they brought in a cargo of slaves to the port of Rio Janeiro, as soon as the poor creatures were able to stand up and walk, they were taken to a long hall to be christened previous to sale. The christening was done by a Catholic priest, for which service he received a certain sum per head, paid by the purchaser, upon receiving a ticket certifying the christening; as we pay the weigher's ticket when we purchase wood or hay. As there were frequently a great many to pass through this ceremony, the priest adopted a very summary method of performing it. The slaves were arranged in two rows, one on each side of the hall. With a large sponge tied to a long stick and filled with water, the priest gave a flit on one side, muttering a few words, and then turned to the other side in the same manner. On one occasion of this kind, an English sailor happened to be present, who had received a liberal education; but through his dissolute and intemperate habits had been disowned by his father, and was so far reduced as to be engaged in the Slave-Trade. When the priest went through the ceremony, and muttered over his Latin, the Englishman laughed. The American asked him what he laughed at? "Why, at what the priest said." "Well, what did he say?" "Why, at the first stroke of his sponge, the English of it was, *This is a fine haul!* and the second stroke, *That brings the money!*"

CHILTON WILLIAM ALLAN, the young Kentucky sculptor, died at his father's residence, on the 6th instant, at the age of *eighteen*.

He was certainly a most extraordinary youth. The *Frankfort Commonwealth* says:

"*At the age of fourteen or fifteen*, he modelled in clay, and cast in plaster, a bust of his honored father's noble features, which, by its extraordinary excellence, at once proved his genius, and perhaps gave direction to his future studies. This was his first attempt, accomplished without aid or instruction, or having ever witnessed any one modelling. He felt his powers stirring within, and with true energy of genius, *snatching a lump of clay* with such rude implements as he could whittle with his pocket-knife, produced a bust, which, we undertake to say, cannot be surpassed in fidelity and spirit, by the very best masters, though it may be in delicacy of touch and finish. He afterwards made several other busts, among which we have only seen those of Mr. Clay, and Mr. Bascom, which are said to be remarkable likenesses."

He was preparing to embark for Europe, to finish his studies—and thus, like Kirk White, he is stricken down in the flower of youth, and in the first flight of genius.—*Albany Atlas.*

Books,

For Sale at the Office of the American A. S. Society, 142 Nassau St. N. Y.

THE LIBERTY BELL of 1844, an Annual, published for the Massachusetts Fair, and consisting of various original articles, from the ablest Anti-Slavery writers in this country, Great Britain and Ireland.

XIMENA, AND OTHER POEMS, by *James Bayard Taylor*. Philadelphia, 1844.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES, or a true picture of the AMERICAN CHURCH AND CLERGY, by *S. S. Foster*; and various other standard Anti-Slavery works.

New-York, July 4, 1844.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

(Second Edition.)

JUST Published, and for sale at this office, a new work on Capital Punishment. By Charles Spear. It contains a variety of thrilling and instructive anecdotes; also, all the capital offenses in every State in the Union; and a speech from O'Connell on the subject. Also, several instances of the execution of the *innocent*. Facts are drawn from history and observation, and the entire scripture ground has been examined. The work is embellished with a fine engraving. Price, 62 1-2 cents.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress*. The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

FREE CALICOES!

JUST received, 1 case fine calicoes. Also, 2 cases fine shirting muslins; together with a large assortment of other free dry goods, at reduced prices, wholesale and retail. CHARLES WISE,

Northwest corner Arch and Fifth streets

Philadelphia, 8th, mo. 17th 1843. tf.

Education and Industry!

THE Northampton Association of Education and Industry have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of fifteen or twenty boarding pupils. They will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of